DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 239 HE 013 695

AUTHOR	Mohrman, Kathryn, Ed.
TITLE	Grants: View from the Campus.
INSTITUTION	Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	79
NOTE	88p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, NW, Washington, DC 20009.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Deans; *Administrative Organization; Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Role; *College Administration; College Faculty; College Presidents; College Role; *Educational Finance; *Fund Raising; *Grantsmanship; Higher Education; Money Management; Philanthropic Foundations; Two Year Colleges; Universities

ABSTRACT

Each of 13 authors, all experienced in obtaining grants, examines a separate element of the grantsgetting process. The essays include: The Characteristics of an Effective Grants Officer (Julia B. Leverenz); The Grants Office (Morton Cooper); Working with the Academic Dean (Robert C. Nordvall); Working with the Development Office (Barbara A. Becker); Working with a University Foundation (James P. Farrelly); Management of External Funding (Ronald J. Etzel); The Faculty (Dorothy A. Frayer); Using Grants for Faculty Development (George A. Morgan); Special Concerns of Two-Year Colleges (John C. Rude); Special Concerns of Four-Year Colleges (Bruce A. Mack); Special Concerns of Comprehensive Colleges and Universities (Lewis N. Pino); and The Role of the President in the Grants Effort (James F. Gollatscheck and Gary D. Hollingsworth). The discussion stresses the importance of grants in strengthening the mission of the college, and the need for support from top administration, especially the president. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED201239

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

GRANTS: VIEWS FROM THE CAMPUS

Edited by
Kathryn Mohrman

FEDERAL RESOURCES
ADVISORY SERVICE

Copyright © 1979 Association of American Colleges
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

HE 013 695

Table of Contents

Introduction i

The Characteristics of an Effective Grants Officer 1
Julia B. Leverenz

The Grants Office 9
Morton Cooper

Working with the Academic Dean 19
Robert C. Nordvall

Working with the Development Office 23
Barbara A. Becker

Working with a University Foundation 27
James P. Farrelly

Management of External Funding 29
Ronald J. Etzel

The Faculty 47
Dorothy A. Frayer

Using Grants for Faculty Development 59
George A. Morgan

Special Concerns of Two-Year Colleges 69
John C. Rude

Special Concerns of Four-Year Colleges 75
Bruce A. Mack

Special Concerns of Comprehensive Colleges and Universities 81
Lewis N. Pino

The Role of the President in the Grants Effort 87
James F. Gollattscheck and Gary D. Hollingsworth

Introduction

GRANTS:
VIEWS
FROM
THE
CAMPUS

Colleges need money as never before—yet outside funding seems increasingly hard to find. Inflation, changing student populations, and career expectations are only three of the many factors pressing higher education institutions to review and restructure their offerings. But program changes take time and money, two scarce commodities on campuses today. For many colleges, one approach to these problems is an intensified search for grants.

Through the years, the Federal Resources Advisory Service has published books on proposal writing and guides to federal funding in support of different disciplines. Now, FRAS issues a volume which complements the previous works by describing the structure needed on campuses to support a strong grants effort. All the good intentions in the world will not consistently bring in outside funding without a carefully devised plan.

The thirteen authors represented in this volume are all experienced grantsgetters. They come from community colleges and research universities, public and independent institutions. From their own experiences they provide practical, how-to-do-it approaches to grants, supported by sound reasons and tested methods. Each author examines a separate element of the grantsgetting process, beginning with the personality of the grants officer. For instance, certain personal characteristics are necessary for success in the different roles a grants officer must play. These are discussed along with office set up and maintenance, from desks and chairs to useful office forms.

An important determinant of campus grants activity is the location of the grants office within the administrative structure of the institution. The reasons for a given position may be political, philosophical, or accidental, but important considerations accompany the decision. Three authors describe the advantages and disadvantages of placing the grants effort within the academic office, the development office, or separate governmental relations or foundation structure.

Of course, grant proposals will only be as successful as the ideas on which they are based. Good ideas most often come from the faculty, yet translating those ideas into successful proposals requires encouragement, support, and hard work from the entire academic community. The chapters on faculty provide a number of specific recommendations for creating this kind of cooperative environment. In addition, they outline a very important approach to the process—using grants consciously as part of the faculty development effort.

While a vital part of the grants process is concern for individuals, it must also be seen as an institutional program strengthening the mission of the college. However, all institutions are not alike, hence the need to discuss separately the special concerns of community colleges, four-year colleges, and comprehensive universities. These discussions stress the importance of grantsgetting for the institution and the need for support from top administration. The president, say the authors, plays a critical role in obtaining outside funding for the programs and activities of the college or university.

From the individual grants officer to the administrators of the institution to the faculty the grants office assists to the president who commits the institution to the program, this book traces the full development cycle of a successful grantsgetting operation. It's a people business—we hope this book will help those people do a better job.

The Characteristics of an Effective Grants Officer

GRANTS:
VIEWS
FROM
THE
CAMPUS

Julia B. Leverenz

The grants officer is the key to an effective college or university grants office. Therefore, it is appropriate to begin this book with a discussion of the types of people who make good grants officers. To do this, I will also consider the duties and responsibilities of the office, which are the framework within which the grantsperson functions. Common sense and management theory indicate that a person who performs well in his or her job is likely to enjoy the work. Thus an important consideration for identifying the personal attributes of a good grantsperson is, "What kind of person would enjoy the duties and responsibilities of the grants office?"

Now, no one will dare to say that being a grants officer is always "fun" because there are inevitably last-minute deadlines to meet and tedious hours to be spent wading through reams of government documents. However, the good grantsperson will take all of these (and more) in stride, recognizing that the frustrations are far outweighed by rewards such as an ecstatic phone call from a faculty member whose first grant just came through, the satisfaction of finding the right federal program for a project which needs support, the sigh of relief when, after months of negotiation, difficulties are resolved to everyone's satisfaction, and ultimately, the pleasure of knowing the word is being spread around on campus to "call the grants office—they can help."

To describe the characteristics of a good grants officer, I will outline the responsibilities of the job and then suggest the personal qualities best suited to each function. The result is a general job description on the one hand and a list of characteristics on the other. Those of you who are new to the field may find both lists to be useful guides for hiring a grants officer or starting a grants office; more seasoned readers, I hope, will find reinforcement and perhaps reassurance as you evaluate your positions within your organizations.

These guides should not be considered definitive. Job descriptions can, and should, vary from institution to institution according to particular needs and staffing limitations. Likewise, individuals who may not seem to "fit" the list of characteristics may be exceptionally fine grantspeople. I encourage you, therefore, to view this chapter as a starting place or a working paper, designed to help you formulate your thoughts about the needs of your institution with regard to setting up or reorganizing a grants office, and the characteristics of the person who runs it.

Julia B. Leverenz is Director of Sponsored Programs at the College of William and Mary.

The Definition of a Grants Officer

The grants officer at a college or university is the person responsible for coordinating all institutional requests for grants from outside agencies (usually federal and state agencies, but foundations and corporations may also be included) for research projects and other programs which involve faculty salaries, overhead recoveries, or extensive accountability (reporting) requirements similar to the requirements for federal grants and contracts. More simply, the grants officer handles the procurement of outside funds for campus research and other sponsored programs. Usually the grants officer's duties in a smaller institution do not include actual financial administration of grant awards.

The grants officer may be a part of the fundraising department of a college; however, a distinction exists between grant-seeking and fundraising. Grants are made for specific expendable purposes, and the programs they fund must be from among the institution's priorities and should enhance its short- and long-range goals. Fundraising covers a much broader range, concentrating on gifts to endowment and unrestricted, expendable gifts for general purposes. At William and Mary, we distinguish between a "grant" and a "gift" according to the following criterion: a grant is money given to support a research or other program which has a stipulated period of performance, stated objectives, and a pre-specified budget linked to the various program components (staff time, travel, materials, etc.). All other donations are classified as gifts.

The Roles of a Grants Officer

The objective of the grants officer is to match projects at the college or university which need support with the right funding agency or program, and then to persuade the agency to award a grant for the project. The two main tasks of the grantsperson, then, are to act as the liaison between the institution and grantmaking agencies, and to assist the members of the institution to prepare and present successful grant applications. The elements of these two main tasks illustrate the personal characteristics which may be most helpful to the effective grantsperson.

The grants office performs a service for the institution, its faculty, students, and staff. This concept is crucial to an understanding of the grantsperson and his or her function. The grantsperson is most often found behind the scenes, assisting and advising, but rarely receiving full credit for a successful grant application. The grantsperson is a facilitator, an interpreter, and, occasionally, a mediator between the college and the funding organization. These roles do not foster the development of a strong personal ego, and indeed, a strong ego or desire for personal recognition can interfere with a grantsperson's effectiveness. Thus, the primary characteristic of a good grantsperson is that he or she should be service-oriented.

7

The Grantsperson as Liaison

One duty of a grantsperson is to act as an interface between the institution and grantmaking agencies. Personal contacts are the most important element of this service. Depending upon the college or university's budgetary restrictions, this may or may not involve travel to visit grantmaking agencies. Extensive telephone contacts are certainly necessary, as are frequent meetings with faculty and staff at home. The effective grantsperson seeks out the people he or she needs to know, identifies those who are most active and most informed, and then cultivates their professional friendship. The grantsperson who knows the faculty and staff at the home institution and the personnel at the grantmaking agencies will find the tasks of gathering information and negotiating awards much less difficult than the grantsperson who is communicating with relative strangers.

Earning the respect and friendship of these key people requires more than a pleasant telephone voice or cheerful smile, however. The grantsperson also needs to have carefully researched the operation and organization of all of the relevant grantmaking agencies as well as of the college or university. This can often be a tedious process, involving endless reading (especially of federal documents) and asking many questions of people on campus and in the agencies. To shorten the learning and research process for a new grantsperson, many colleges and universities seek to fill the position with an individual who has worked in an academic institution as a teacher or administrator and has experience with government agencies.

I cannot overemphasize the grantsperson's need to be thoroughly familiar with his or her institution. By understanding the priorities and objectives of the college or university, the grantsperson can avoid wasting effort on grant programs which may not be appropriate. The effective grantsperson narrows down the vast array of program deadlines and regulations to a more manageable group compatible with the character and aims of the institution.

During the process of making contacts and researching the organizations, the grantsperson identifies both the campus programs which need funding, as well as the outside funding opportunities which are available. Matching the two can require a certain amount of imagination. The funding opportunities should be presented to the faculty in such a way as to stir them into action writing grant proposals. And the interest of the funding agency should be aroused so that a climate of receptiveness will greet the final proposal. Imaginative listening can help a faculty member develop a clearer proposal concept, and imaginative planning involving the appropriate people can smooth the way for a successful application.

The grantsperson as liaison also plays an important part in determining the institution's own policies regarding grant applications and bears the responsibility for ensuring that internal policies and procedures are followed. Part of the grantsperson's duty is identifying and interpreting agency application (procurement) guidelines, recognizing those which need to be incorporated into internal grant policies. To perform these functions, the grantsperson needs to work closely with other departments and divisions at the institution both to establish internal procedures and then to keep others at the institution informed of activities in the grants office. Representatives from all affected segments of the institution should periodically be informed of applicable federal regulations.

Liaison with the college's business office, in particular, is critical. In most institutions, a member of the financial staff reviews proposal budgets before they are submitted. The grantsperson should also be alert to any difficulties which may arise in the administration of grants in progress, since these can affect the outcome of future grant applications to that agency. It is helpful for the grantsperson to understand the principles of grants administration; he or she certainly needs to be aware of the components of an accurate proposal budget.

In order to stay abreast of developments in other departments and to persuade the authors of grant proposals to comply with procedures and regulations, the grantsperson must, again, have earned the respect and trust of the individuals concerned. In addition to the characteristics I have already mentioned, assertiveness is a useful trait, particularly when encouraging compliance with regulations. Although policies established internally should be flexible enough to allow exceptions, federal regulations are often inflexible; it is generally best to adopt policies which may be applied firmly and consistently in all except the most unusual circumstances. Once the accepted procedures have been determined and put into effect, the efficiency and credibility of the grants office will rest, in part, with the grantsperson's determination to adhere to them. When exercised with tact and diplomacy, the grantsperson's assertiveness will not jeopardize the good relationships that he or she has so carefully fostered within the institution.

The final area in which the grantsperson acts as liaison between the college or university and the grantmaking agency is the negotiation phase of a grant or contract. Some agencies require at least a cursory negotiation (often just a phone call from the procurement officer, saying, "We're going to award what you asked. Is that all right?"), and others require none at all. However, some negotiations become extremely involved and may last for months before a compromise is reached. These complicated negotiations can be a major drain on the grantsperson's time and patience and can also strain relations on campus if persons outside the grants office are required to participate over an extended period. Strategic planning, patience, perseverance, diplomacy, and knowing when to call in an expert are all keys to successful negotiations, along with every kind of skill the grantsperson may have in basic human relations.

Implied in all of the traits mentioned so far is the ability to communicate well, both orally and in writing. Good oral communication skills and good human relations skills are very nearly inseparable, and, of course, excellence in written communication is an integral part of a successful grant application.

The Grantsperson as Internal Assistant

The second main service of the campus grantsperson is to assist the members of the institution to prepare and present successful grant applications. All of the personal characteristics described above are essential to effective performance in this area as well. However, others come to mind in relation to the intricacies of coordinating proposal preparation and submission. The grantsperson may be called upon to write some proposals, underscoring the need for a thorough understanding of what makes a good proposal and for the ability to write clearly and simply. More often, however, the grantsperson is responsible for reviewing all proposals to outside agencies from the institution, particularly to verify that internal and external policies have been followed with regard to matching funds, staff time commitments, and budget accuracy. If there is time, the grantsperson may also offer editorial assistance to proposal writers, particularly those who are new to grants.

In order to minimize last minute problems and misunderstandings, many grants officers schedule regular meetings with groups of faculty to inform them of deadlines, proposal writing techniques, and the services which can be provided by the grants office. These grants seminars are generally more effective than exclusive reliance upon written materials distributed to the faculty; however, procedures should be carefully outlined and published for use as working and reference documents during and between the seminars. The grantsperson thus becomes a teacher of teachers, and the faculty will appreciate these efforts to keep them informed, particularly if their interest is sustained by the grantsperson's creative and intelligent written and oral presentations.

The grantsperson also works with individual faculty members who are in the process of preparing and submitting grant proposals. Here again, the goal is to encourage the faculty member to come to the grantsperson very early in the process. The best way to approach this goal is to meet as many faculty as possible and to acquaint them with the benefits of involving the grants office from the beginning. The assistance provided to the individuals can range from simple review and processing of an experienced investigator's proposal to involvement in every step of the development of an uncertain young faculty member's first efforts.

Recognizing the degree of assistance which is needed requires perception on the part of the grantsperson, particularly in the case of the inexperienced proposal writer. The grantsperson should be encouraging, enthusiastic, and optimistic, and these qualities should be tempered with realism lest the individual become overly discouraged if the application is delayed or rejected. The grantsperson's enthusiasm and efforts to explore alternative sources of support for a worthwhile project can be a helpful distraction from the disappointment of rejection. In addition, a helpful and positive attitude towards the grants process will encourage the faculty to continue to develop and submit their proposal ideas.

The grantsperson who has initiative and is self-motivated will be in a much better position to coordinate campus grants efforts. By meeting regularly with faculty and administrators and developing comfortable relationships with them, the grantsperson will be more in touch with campus activities than if he or she waits for the people and ideas to come to the grants office. The grantsperson will thus be able to anticipate some problems and periods of heavy grants activity so that he or she can plan for the most efficient use of grants office staff time. A self-motivated grantsperson will also be more effective in setting goals for the grants office and in devising successful methods for meeting the goals. One of the requirements for meeting any goal is to have the cooperation of the individuals involved, whether they are faculty, administrators, or grants office staff. Therefore, in addition to being self-motivated, the grantsperson should be able to motivate others to support the objectives of the grants office.

Notwithstanding every precaution, a few proposals will appear without warning within hours of an immovable deadline. For this reason, the grantsperson should be able to work well under pressure and to accept such emergencies gracefully. Some of these situations may be prevented in the future; however, circumstances do arise which make "last minute panics" inevitable.

Additional Characteristics

There are a few additional personal characteristics which can help the grantsperson's job run a little more smoothly. The first of these is a sense of humor. I once spent a very productive hour with William and Mary's poet in residence, laughing over the compromises needed to make his creative (but flowery) grant proposal fit the guidelines and the space allocated by the Virginia Arts Agency's application form. Second, it helps to be organized. The grantsperson who feels generally on top of his or her job will be more likely to adapt to emergencies and interruptions. Third, although this is always difficult, the grantsperson should try to accept and learn from the inevitable mistakes and failures. One experience of being summarily ushered out of someone's office should provide plenty of material for preventing it from happening again. And every grantsperson knows that a proposal rejected by one agency may very well be revised and then accepted by the same agency or another, given the right combination of ideas, timing, presentation, skill, and, perhaps, luck.

Finally, the grantsperson needs to feel a sense of dedication to the institution and to the individuals who are a part of it. I began this chapter with the suggestion that a good grants officer should enjoy his or her work. A dedicated grants officer enjoys the satisfaction of having successfully worked through the many challenges of his or her job, and willingly devotes the necessary time and hard work to meet each challenge.

In sum, I have endeavored to identify the personal characteristics of an effective grantsperson, as they relate to the tasks and responsibilities generally assigned to his or her position. As promised, I conclude with the following tables, which list both the job duties and the characteristics of the grantsperson I have thus described.

The Duties and Characteristics of the Campus Grants Officer

Job Description

- Coordinates contacts between the college or university and potential grantmaking agencies.

- Establishes personal contacts with potential grantmaking agencies to identify funding opportunities and to promote the college or university.
- Meets regularly with the faculty and administrators to:
  - identify campus projects which need outside support
  - conduct proposal writing and grantsmanship seminars
  - explain federal and campus policies and regulations which apply to grants
  - promote the services of the grants office
- Works closely with key administrators and faculty to develop policies and procedures applicable to grants and contracts.
- Prepares and regularly updates written manual of policies and procedures and distributes to faculty and administrators. Also distributes notices regarding funding opportunities and deadlines to individuals or groups of faculty as applicable.
- Reviews all grant proposals submitted to outside agencies and assures compliance with institutional and agency standards.
- Works with individual faculty and staff to prepare competitive proposals; may personally prepare some proposals.
- Personally presents or assists with presentation of proposals to funding agencies; works with appropriate individuals on and off campus, as needed, to develop strategies to enhance a proposal's competitive position.
- Acts as institutional representative during negotiations with grantmaking agencies.
- Defines goals for grants office and assigns and supervises grants office staff efforts to meet these goals.

Personal Characteristics

- Service-oriented
- Works well with people
- Writes and speaks well
- Familiar with educational institutions and government agencies
- Knows proposal writing techniques and principles of grantsgetting
- Self-motivated
- Persuasive
- Tactful
- Perceptive
- Familiar with federal policies regarding grants financial management
- Imaginative
- Patient
- Perserverant
- Assertive

- Has good judgment
- Enthusiastic
- Optimistic (but realistic)
- Works well under pressure
- Dedicated, hard-working
- Has a sense of humor
- Organized.

GRANTS:
VIEWS
FROM
THE
CAMPUS

The Grants Office

Morton Cooper

Suppose the president of your college or university called you into his office one morning and asked you to become the college's director of grants. You may be familiar with the humanities but really don't know that much about the sciences. Where would you start? How much money is needed for setting up an office? Where do you get reference material?

Office Budget

Determining the amount of funds needed for establishing a grants office is not really that difficult, even though the president may caution that money is tight. Let us assume the director of grants is on a 12-month contract and receives an annual salary of $18,000.

Since the president is so interested in obtaining outside grants, you should be able to talk him into providing a secretary for the office. Although the secretary will not be fully occupied typing letters of transmittal during the first few months, he/she could type proposals for various departments; type manuscripts for the faculty in these publish-or-perish times; type your guide to proposal writing; and write to all the agencies for reference material. For all this a secretary would probably receive a grand salary of $7500.

As far as your office is concerned, Mecca is also referred to as Washington, DC. Depending on the number of the faculty, their special interests, and the proximity of the college to Washington, you may go there monthly, quarterly, or semi-annually. Assuming that $300 would cover one round trip including hotel and food, then $600 should be the minimum expense budget. Visiting state agencies could conceivably be done for $300, bringing the total budgeting for travel to $1200.

Communication is a very important aspect of the position as it involves not only faculty and staff but prospective funding agencies as well. Therefore, it is important to make sure that letterhead paper, envelopes, and postage are provided for in the budget. (Spreading the word of funding opportunities can get expensive—even if done by ditto or mimeograph.) If your budget

---

Morton Cooper is Director of Contracts and Grants at East Tennessee State University.

specifies recycling envelopes and using the backs of old memos for scratch paper, $50 a month for supplies should be adequate. Don't be afraid to call the federal regional office or Washington if information or forms are needed; $25 a month should take care of these telephone needs. Even though agencies issue many publications each year, your budget should include about $200 for purchasing some of the books and periodicals mentioned later. A calculator and cassette tape recorder may run another $200.

Thus far, the total for establishing and operating an office so that it will be efficient and helpful is $28,000. The figures given are on the conservative side and may need adjustment for your area. Depending on the school's schedule, the director of grants could also teach one class each semester and one during the summer. By these means, part of the salary could be charged to the instructional account until such time as the research on campus warrants a full-time grantsgetter.

Personnel

Directors of grants do not have to be faculty members, nor do they have to hold a terminal academic degree. What is required is that individual be a good organizer, possess an ability for working with people, and have some ability for editing and writing. The director is not really expected to be an expert in all academic areas but is expected to have a "feel" for what each agency is looking for. Patience and perseverance are the key ingredients in helping the faculty succeed.

Your second in command, generally the secretary, must be able to keep the files in order and have some familiarity with the Washington alphabet soup game. For this office to operate properly, a high level of interpersonal effectiveness is necessary; there is daily contact with faculty, staff, and administrators. Therefore, pleasantness is important to ensure a harmonious working relationship with the campus community. The secretary can make your job immeasurably easier by anticipating the next step, whether it be ordering forms or providing the entity number for an application. If you really want to make it easy on yourself and ensure continuity of operation when you are out of town, train your secretary to handle some of the routine grants duties. If you are still learning some of the finer points of the arts of grantsgetting, share these new items. By so doing your secretary could take on some or the qualities of an administrative assistant. If he/she can meet the challenge, make sure there is encouragement and suitable rewards.

Services Offered

Many articles have been written about the billions of dollars available for research, training, or demonstration projects. Few articles have been written about the frustration experienced

15

by a new faculty member who doesn't know where to start, or a faculty member who was informed by a new president that he/she was now expected to do research.

A major problem normally encountered by these faculty is that organized information on potential funding sources is not readily available on the campus. There is probably also a lack of experienced personnel in this area.

One of the services that should be offered by a new director of grants is an agency information system. It is imperative that this information be kept current and filed in such a manner that any report from any agency can be located with ease. Also, if the office layout permits, the files should be available in a "reference room" location. For many individuals, browsing through agency material is a new experience and they should feel comfortable doing it. If a faculty member finds something of interest, he or she will ask for more information. This behooves the director of grants to become familiar with the agency literature. The better informed a person is, the better he/she can do the job of helping faculty to secure outside funding.

Another service that is a logical extension of the information-gathering process is the information dissemination process—a grants newsletter. This is discussed in another chapter. There is nothing to prevent you from copying articles from publications such as the *Federal Register* and sending them to potentially-interested faculty. Better yet, visit faculty members and discuss the articles with them.

As mentioned in the personnel section, the director of grants should be able and willing to edit proposals in a rough draft stage. At this point changes can be easily made and the proposal strengthened without upsetting the proposal writer. A question may arise as to who the proposal writer should be. The project usually begins as an idea in the mind of a faculty member; only the faculty member knows precisely what needs to be accomplished and what approach to use. After fully thinking along these lines and doing the necessary literature search, he or she should write down the details in a concise and detailed fashion. When a time schedule and a cost estimate are added, the resulting document becomes a proposal. The director of grants should only be expected to help the faculty member—not do the job itself. Encourage the faculty member to obtain an informal peer review of the rough draft.

Sometimes it may be necessary for the director of grants to mediate differences of opinion between a faculty member and an academic dean or budget director. If such situations are handled in an above-board and diplomatic manner, the grants officer's reputation for being fair is enhanced and his/her counsel will be sought before a situation gets out of hand.

Most faculty have difficulty in establishing a budget for their project. There is nothing magical about carefully considering all the elements necessary to make the proposed project operate efficiently, determining the quantity necessary, and then putting the estimated cost down on a sheet of paper. Fringe benefits and indirect costs are just percentages applied to specific numbers such as salaries and wages and some indirect costs are specified by the agency such as eight percent of total direct cost. Some agencies require budget forms (Public Health Service); others use formats (National Science Foundation).

Does the project involve testing children in school? Are questionnaires being used? Are they going to determine helping behavior, phobias, etc.? These projects must be reviewed by a human subject review board. If the institution does not have one, then help establish it. HEW regulations appear occasionally in the *Federal Register.*

You can help establish other committees such as radiation safety and animal care if they do not already exist. Do you have copyright and patent policies? So that everybody doesn't have to reinvent the wheel, is there a brochure (other than the general catalog) that provides a brief background of your institution?

What would be extremely helpful in stimulating interest in research is a grants-in-aid fund. Faculty would apply to you or a committee for funds to purchase supplies like computer tapes, chemicals, animals; go to Washington to visit agencies; do library research for a day or two; or pay for questionnaire postage.

Sources of Information

There are many publications that claim they should be in your basic library pertaining to grants and contracts. The basic publications of the past are still the ones most used today. Some sources of information are greatly overpriced while others are free if you know where to write.

The following publications are not intended to comprise a comprehensive list of basic books or periodicals. Also, the fact that a publication is not included does not reflect negatively on its merit. It must also be realized that prices are subject to change without notice.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance. Almost 1000 pages of detailed information on federal programs including who's eligible, how to apply, and what the deadlines are. There are eight different indexes: Agency Programs, Functional, Individual, Local, State, Nonprofit Organizations and Institutions, Popular Name, and Subject. This publication is a must for every grants office. Order from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. Current price is $20 including updates.

Federal Register. Tells you what is happening on a day-to-day basis. Most proposed and final regulations governing federal programs appear in the *Register,* which is published Monday through Friday. Notices of availability of grants and their deadlines are included. Subscription includes a monthly and quarterly index. Order from the Superintendent of Documents. Cost is $5 per month or $50 per year.

Annual Register of Grant Support. Summarizes program purposes of private foundations, eligibility, application information, deadlines, total funds distributed, average grants, and the number of applicants compared with the number of grant recipients. The founding date and a list of officers, board, and staff of the foundation are included. There are about 1800 entries and the book can be ordered from Marquis Who's Who, 200 East Ohio Street, Chicago, IL 60611, Attention: Order Department. The 1977-78 edition costs $52.50 plus $2 shipping and handling.

Foundation Directory, Edition 6. This is the basic source of information concerning the country's major foundations. This edition list 2817 foundations with assets of $1 million or more or total annual grants of at least $100,000; entries are relatively short but concise. Although published by the Foundation Center, the *Directory* must be ordered from Columbia University Press, 136 South Broadway, Irvington NY 10511. Price is $35 plus $1 postage and handling.

United States Government Manual. Describes every government department, commission, and quasi-governmental organization with agency addresses, telephone numbers, and names of key personnel listed. The *Manual* is useful for obtaining names and additional addresses for many of the programs described in the *Catalog*. It is issued annually and can be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents for $6.50.

Grantsmanship Center NEWS. This magazine deals in depth with both public and private funding. It includes numerous how-to articles about obtaining grants, writing proposals, planning programs, managing nonprofit organizations, and developing resources, as well as information on grants programs and deadlines. Order from Grantsmanship Center, 1015 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90015. Six issues cost $15.

Commerce Business Daily. A daily listing of U.S. Government Procurement invitations, contract awards, subcontracting leads, sales of surplus property, and foreign business opportunities. While it is oriented to private business firms, it is of interest to those educational institutions which are technically-oriented or have schools of engineering. Cost is $105 per year and it can be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents.

Then, of course, there are the fine books put out by Federal Resources Advisory Service, the publisher of this book. They are:

Federal Grants: A Basic Handbook

Directory of Selected Federal Program Offices

A Guide to Federal Funding in the Arts and Humanities; Social Sciences; Physical and Mathematical Sciences; Biological Sciences; Education and Libraries; and Health Sciences.

The following publications are free for the writing:

NIH for Grants and Contracts. Published at irregular intervals to provide policy and administrative information to individuals and organizations who need to be kept informed of requirements and changes in grants and contracts activities administered by the National Institutes of Health. Its supplements concern new projects, solicitations of sources, and requests for proposals. Write to Grants and Contracts Guide Distribution Center, Division of Research Grants, NIH, Room 219, Westwood Building, Bethesda, MD 20014 and request to be put on the mailing list.

NSF Bulletin. Contains information on programs, deadlines, publications, and other activities. The *Bulletin* contains forms for requesting material and you can easily be added to their mailing list. It is issued monthly except for July and August. Write to the National Science Foundation, 1800 G Street, NW, Washington, DC 20550, Attention: Mail Security and Records Section.

In addition to these two publications, catalogs, forms, guidelines, summaries of funded projects, and copies of successful proposals are available and very helpful. Agency telephone directories are of great help when trying to locate the proper office or person.

If you write to the federal agencies for general brochures or to be put on their mailing list the simplest way to have your request handled expeditiously is to address the letter to the attention of the public information office. Either they will handle it or route your letter to the person who can.

Forms

Any office worth its salt can surely dream up at least half-a-dozen complicated forms that must be filled out in quadruplicate! However, there is no reason for grants office forms to be confusing. The neater and more efficient your forms are, the more efficient your office will appear in the eyes of the faculty and administration. The only forms really required are those that ensure that everyone who has to approve an application has done so, and those that keep track of proposals and awards.

Appendix A of this section is a copy of a routing form used by East Tennessee State University. It will be noted there are two signature spaces provided for project director, chairman, and dean. These are useful for interdisciplinary projects. The check-off space on the right side of the form serves to notify others within the institution that further approval may be necessary. When routing the application for signatures, remember that when dealing with a bureaucracy, it always takes longer than it should.

The other forms shown as Appendix B and C are for use within the grants office. Appendix B can be done on paper or card stock and is of a convenient size for keeping in a desk drawer or for taking to Washington. The middle area is large enough so that ten years of awards can be noted. A card is made out for every proposal and the top line completed when action has been taken. Appendix C is a master log for monthly reports, annual reports, or reviewing activity by department.

Now that you have set up your office, purchased reference material, designed the forms, and advertised your services, you are ready to help the faculty submit proposals to agency program directors who are busy, impatient, skeptical, not especially interested in your problems, and are faced with many more requests than they can read thoroughly, let alone fund.

Welcome to the group in search of the Fountain of Funding.

Appendix A

EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

APPLICATION FOR OUTSIDE SPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY ACTIVITIES

Log No.	Project Director (Name & Dept.)	Proposed Sponsor	Proposed Period

___New ___Continuation ___Renewal ___Supplemental Funds ___Revision

Title:

Estimated Costs	1st Year	Total	Years
Sponsor	______	______	__
E T S U	______	______	__
Other	______	______	__

Indirect Costs Requested	1stYear	Total	Years
_____% of Salaries	______	______	__
_____% of	______	______	__

Comments:

CERTIFICATION OF PROJECT DIRECTOR

I certify that the proposed budget reflects, to the best of my knowledge, the true direct costs associated with this project.

Will the proposed project require:

YES	NO	
___	___	Acquisition or remodeling of space?
___	___	Humans as research subjects?
___	___	Computer Center services?
___	___	Animals under USDA regulations?
___	___	Radioactive chemicals or materials?

Project Director Date

Project Co-director Date

REVIEWED FOR FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS

Director of Budgets

CERTIFICATION OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN

I have reviewed this application and consider it technically sound. It is compatible with Department plans, programs, and faculty time allocation.

Department Chairman Date

Department Chairman (if applicable) Date

CERTIFICATION OF CONTRACTS AND GRANTS OFFICE

I have reviewed this application for editorial and substantive content and for conformance to sponsor and University policies.

Director, Contracts and Grants

APPROVED

Vice President for Academic Affairs

Accounting Office

CERTIFICATION OF DEAN OF COLLEGE

I have reviewed this application and consider it in keeping with College plans and programs and the availability of facilities, personnel, equipment and supporting services.

Dean of College Date

Dean of College (If applicable) Date

THIS FORM IS FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY !

DO NOT MAIL

Appendix B

			/	$
PROJECT DIRECTOR	DEPT. - SCHOOL	AGENCY & NUMBER	PERIOD	AWARD

TITLE

REQUESTED $ (YRS) COST SHARE ____ (YRS) TOTAL $ (YRS)	AGY. PROPOSAL NO.	DATE SUBMITTED	LOG NO	RESEARCH LOCATION

REVISIONS:

AMOUNT	FROM	TO
$		

FUTURE SUPPORT	
(TDC)	(YR)

TYPE G C

NEW CONT SUPP REN

RES TNG CR INST

PREVIOUS

AWARDED	REJECTED
WITHDRAWN	OTHER

REMARKS:

ALSO SUBMITTED TO

AGENCY ACTION

Appendix C

Log No.	Name of Investigator	Date Submitted	Agency	Univ. Dept.	Title	Amount Requested 1st Year	Total Amount Requested	Date of Action	Action Taken	Amount Awarded 1st Year	Total Amount Awarded	Period

Working With The Academic Dean

GRANTS: VIEWS FROM THE CAMPUS

Robert C. Nordvall

General Relationship with Academic Policy

A grants office is likely to be under the supervision of either the academic dean (vice president) or the chief development officer. There may be divided jurisdiction so that grants to faculty members or departments for academic projects (for example, a National Science Foundation grant for the improvement of a science course) are the responsibility of the dean or someone who reports to the dean while grants for advancement of the whole institution (for example, a National Endowment for the Humanities challenge grant) are the responsibility of the development officer.

There is an obvious advantage to placing the function of assisting faculty members to obtain grants in a central development office; this one office can then coordinate grant applications both for individual faculty projects and general institutional advancement. Yet, there are countervailing disadvantages. At a small college or university the development office will not be large enough to hire a person whose sole responsibility is to assist faculty members. A development office is often judged by the total funds which it attracts to the institution. Thus, the natural tendency of a development office will be to concentrate on larger projects of institutional advancement as contrasted with smaller requests for faculty grants. Furthermore, the chief development officer is likely to want staff members primarily with fundraising experience rather than academic experience. As a result, faculty members may be suspicious of the ability of a development officer to understand academic needs.

Where a full-time person for faculty grant activity is not possible, there are strong arguments for placing the grant assistance function in the office of the academic dean. This office is most familiar with the academic policy matters which are often related to faculty grants. For example, a grant proposal that requires an extensive use of scarce academic computing facilities will be reviewed through the perspective of the necessary apportionment of computer resources among academic departments. The dean's office, in working with faculty members, learns about their specific academic interests so that announcements of grant opportunities can be brought to

---

Robert C. Nordvall is Assistant Dean of the College at Gettysburg College.

the attention of faculty members for whom they are particularly appropriate. This office should also know more about the strengths and weaknesses of faculty members than the development office. Thus, a request from a faculty member notorious for suggesting ideas without following through with them, can receive a measured response until the faculty member evidences a serious intent to pursue the grant possibilities.

Assuming that the function of assisting faculty members in seeking grants is located in the dean's office, the first necessity is establishing the internal and external responsibilities of the person assigned this role.

Internal Responsibilities

Internally there needs to be an agreement on the purposes of the grants program. Is this merely a service for faculty who request it, or should there be an effort to encourage faculty to seek grant funds? If such encouragement is desired, how will the importance of grants activity be communicated to the faculty? Will career process and salary decisions take into account the faculty member's effort to obtain grant funds? Is the grants officer expected to review all proposals completed for both content and form or are these only to be reviewed to determine the obligations that they place upon the institution and their possible conflicts with institutional policy? Are some types of grants to be particularly encouraged or discouraged (for example, grants that obligate the institution to continue the project with its own funds after the grant expires)? Is the grants officer expected to be responsible for insuring that more applications are made, that more applications are funded, or merely that faculty members are satisfied with the services provided to them?

Once these questions are answered, it will be possible to frame goals and objectives upon which the performance of the grants officer can be judged. For example, if the grants officer is to be evaluated primarily according to the level of satisfaction of faculty members seeking assistance with grant applications, then the grants officer has primary control over the factors upon which the evaluation is based. If, on the other hand, the success of the grants officer's work will be measured by the volume of applications made or funded, then meeting this criterion may require that the dean and the president communicate to the faculty the importance of obtaining grants and that career process and salary decisions will reflect this importance.

External Responsibilities

Externally, the division of responsibility with other offices must be determined. There should be guidelines for what types of grants are to be generated through the dean's office and which ones should go through the development office. There should be coordination between the two offices in order to work out any problems of interpreting these guidelines and in order to maintain a library of grants publications and services without expensive duplication. The two offices should exchange information about funding sources. There should be consultation between these offices before a grant is submitted to be sure that there are no conflicts or duplications between applications from each office. For example, if the institution is approaching a private foundation for a large institutional grant, this may have to take precedence over a proposal to the same foundation by an academic department.

Coordination is also required with the president's office and the business office. The president often must sign grant applications. He or she must be aware of the obligations, both financial and otherwise, that the grant places upon the institution. The business office should approve any financial obligations before the grant application is submitted. If the application is successful, procedures for administering the grant funds and making the necessary reports should be established. Ordinarily, these will primarily involve the business office and project director but a system to insure proper administration must be implemented.

In some office there should be a master information file with an inventory of all proposals submitted by persons at the institution. This should at least contain a fact sheet for each proposal including the name of the applicant, the funding agency to which it is submitted, date of submission, purpose of the proposal, amount requested, and the result of the submission.

For grants involving human or animal subjects, some federal agencies require an institutional review panel to review the application and certify that it meets appropriate standards for the protection of the subjects. The grants officer should be responsible for monitoring the establishment and functioning of these panels.

The most important task of the grants officer is not the definition of responsibility or the determination of relationships with other offices in the institution. It is, instead, helping faculty members to learn about and obtain grants. This may involve getting advice from successful grants officers at other institutions. What do they read? Many commercial services offer advice and information about obtaining grants. To which ones do the successful grants officers subscribe? No two institutions are identical, but advice from grants officers at similar institutions can provide excellent ideas for the grants officer as he or she gets down to the central job of helping people get grants.

GRANTS: VIEWS FROM THE CAMPUS

Working With The Development Office

Barbara A. Becker

While the policies and practice of most academic institutions indicate general agreement on the primary functions of a development office—to coordinate and facilitate the raising of funds and other appropriate material resources to support the educational purposes of the institution—there seems to be no such clear cut consensus regarding the relationship of a grants operation to the development office. A survey of current practice in four-year colleges reveals a wide range of alternative arrangements for the placement of the grants office within an administrative structure.

In some institutions proposal submission is made entirely dependent upon the initiative and follow-through of faculty, acting individually or in groups, with very little coordination or accountability. In others, a highly organized office of government relations is responsible for all grant proposals and its head reports directly to the president. In between are all kinds of more or less centralized arrangements.

Incorporating Grants Getting Into the Development Office

However, when one examines the objectives, resources, and daily tasks of a development office, along with its focus on fundraising, there would appear to be a sound rationale for incorporating the grants operation into its total responsibilities. A development office, in its contacts with the institution's many constituencies and particularly in its fundraising activities, must be guided by the abiding mission and current goals and priorities of the institution. In much the same way, a good grants operation must be consonant with the institution's mission, goals, and current priorities. Thus, viewing the grants operation as an integral part of the development office's fundraising function and placing it within the administrative structure of that office can capitalize on these common elements and significantly contribute to the kind of coordination which best serves a college or university.

Barbura A. Becker is Assistant to the President at Mount St. Mary's College (California).

Insofar as the term "grant" is commonly used in referring to the monetary contributions which foundations and corporations make, as well as to government funding, the alliance of a grants operation with the development office can also provide a centralization of the institution's fundraising efforts. There can be a sharing of research sources and files; of data, charts, and graphs designed in support of proposed programs and projects; and even of those written materials basic to any good proposal (i.e., a brief history and description of the college, a profile of its current student body and faculty, a brief description of its academic programs).

Furthermore, it would appear that most of the government funding, other than student financial aid, which comes into four-year institutions, in particular, is in support of educational programs and projects. The formulation of proposals requesting such grants is usually best done by a sound academician, one with a thorough understanding of the institution's educational program. Because many of the approaches which a development officer makes to corporations and foundations are also related to educational programs and projects, and recognizing the fact that many development offices employ fundraisers rather than educators, the placement of an academician as grantswriter in the development office can provide the expertise necessary for producing successful proposals to both the corporate and government sectors.

Day-to-Day Operation

How this works out in day-to-day operations is exemplified by the case of a music faculty member, moderator of that department's chamber music society. She contacted the development office regarding the possibility of securing some external funding to supplement the operating monies annually provided by the institution. The grantsperson discussed with her, at length, the history and performance record of the chamber music society, along with her vision of its future and the need for additional monies. A careful review of the society's financial record gave vital information regarding budget projections for the future.

Once the skeleton of a proposal was in order: (1) *what* she wanted to do, incorporating concrete objectives; (2) *why* it was a good (unique) idea; (3) *how* she proposed to achieve the objectives set; (4) *when* it would be done, along with a realistic timetable; (5) *who* would benefit; and, (6) *how much* it would cost—then the research on prospective funding sources began.

With the grants operation as part of the development office, it was possible to survey corporate and foundation prospects as well as government agencies in a single concerted effort. In the former category, the emphasis was on those which included the arts among their priorities, gave grants within the range required by the proposed budget, and had a giving record to musical societies and/or institutions comparable to ours. A brief survey of government agencies quickly pinpointed the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities as the most promising. Insofar as all of the program announcements, including guidelines, deadlines, and application forms are on file in the grants office, contacts with these agencies moved along much more quickly than with the private sources.

Once the appropriate preliminary contacts were made, the process of actually writing the proposals began. Here again, there was a great savings of time and effort because the same person who was completing the application forms for NEA and NEH, was also writing the narratives which formed the major portion of the proposal to private foundations and corporations. Some pertinent data from the endowment applications could appropriately be incorporated into the narratives of the proposal to private foundations. Having a single office responsible for both types of proposals significantly reduced any duplication of effort and enhanced a desirable consistency in message and format. On a continuing basis, it also means that more often than not, the right hand does indeed know what the left hand is proposing!

Insofar as the president is a key figure in any grants effort, whether it is directed toward government funding or support from the private sector, allying the grants effort with the development office may well both centralize and simplify the operation, thus conserving valuable executive time. Communications from the president's office to the development office automatically reach the grantsperson, so that a single directive to seek funds for a particular project or program is responded to with an exploration of *all* possible sources of funding. By the same token, reports from the development office, whether periodic or annual, are comprehensive and represent the total fundraising effort of the institution.

Finally, a survey of one development officer regarding the advantages of bringing the grants operation into the development office brought this response: "Asking for money can be a lonely enterprise. Having the grantsperson here makes me feel less isolated, more in the mainstream of the college and in tune with its mission and goals." Perhaps this is the best argument of all for joining the two efforts. Good development directors are hard to find!

28

Working With a University Foundation

GRANTS:
VIEWS
FROM
THE
CAMPUS

James P. Farrelly

In some instances the administration and coordination of sponsored research activities are consigned to a university foundation or an office of governmental relations. These organizational units are usually distinct but integral parts of an overall university operation. Because they are distinct, they can develop and maintain separate and extensive facilities for conducting research and can recruit a research staff of scientists, engineers, and technicians well-qualified to conduct basic and applied research in a wide range of technical disciplines. Because they are integral, they can initiate and pursue research which is responsive to the needs of the technical community and which contributes to a university's educational goals and can encourage and assist faculty and staff members in their efforts to secure extramural support for their research projects and training programs. A university foundation or an office of governmental relations can serve as a coordinating center for a university's sponsored research programs and as a bridge between the academic sector and the technical community at large.

A sample organizational chart for a university foundation or an office of governmental relations might include the following:

Board of Trustees
President

Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dean for Graduate Studies and Research

Director of Office of Governmental Relations

Associate Director for Interdisciplinary Research
Associate Director for Program Development

The important line positions in terms of grantsgetting and proposal writing are the associate directors for interdisciplinary research and for program development. The former would oversee

---

James P. Farrelly is Staff Specialist for the Humanities at the Research Institute, University of Dayton.

the in-house research operation, while the latter would direct a professional program development staff. Together they would be responsible for the planning, preparing, processing, submitting, negotiating, and administering of all proposals and research agreements between a university and outside organizations.

Ideally, the associate director for program development would design his operation to include offices of contracts and grants administration, technical and information services, faculty liaison and communication, and survey research and evaluation. Of these, the office of faculty liaison and communication would be the most vital in assisting faculty and staff in their efforts to obtain funding for their research projects. Staffed with representatives for a university's academic divisions, this office could include program specialists in the humanities, social sciences, sciences, and engineering. These specialists would handle direct line communication between the university foundation or office of governmental relations and all members of the university community. This arrangement provides each potential grant seeker with a program officer who is knowledgeable not only in proposal preparation but in the applicant's field as well.

Under the guidance of these program officers—who usually divide their time between the research office and their academic departments—faculty and staff members receive budget preparation information, technical editing services, final processing and submittal assistance, and, for successful grants, accounting, purchasing, property, and personnel administration.

A university foundation or an office of governmental relations usually is formed when a university decides to consolidate the administration of sponsored research programs. Because of the inherent unity of purpose and effort involved in this consolidation, a university can reap great benefits from both government and non-government funding sources. On the other hand, because of the specialized nature of the research operation within a university, the danger of separatism is ever-present and must be offset by strong administrative control from the president on down. Properly staffed and run, a university foundation or an office of governmental relations can become the cornerstone of a university's operation: distinct and integral at the same time.

Management of External Funding

GRANTS:
VIEWS
FROM
THE
CAMPUS

Ronald J. Etzel

The management of external funding can encompass a wide variety of activities and responsibilities. The grants administrator is a broker between the faculty, the central administration of the institution, and the external agencies. Grants management thus requires talents in several areas including personnel relations, procurement, public relations, accounting and business functions, as well as various other supporting services. Regardless of the location of the grants development office in an organizational chart, the successful management of external funding will require a balance between the needs and demands of the faculty, the central administration, and the external agencies.

The success of the institution in receiving external support will depend largely upon the abilities of the grants administrator and staff to accomplish the objectives and meet the service needs in the general area of grants opportunities development, proposal development, and management services. One familiar complaint among grant administrators is the amount of time consumed by the management service requirements since, as the argument goes, it is not the management services which contribute toward bringing in the dollars. Nevertheless, deficiencies in the management function will inevitably detract from the developmental function. If the grants office is effectively organized and the management services are efficiently designed, then there will be adequate time to devote to developmental activities, as well as maintaining an effective service credibility with faculty who are often skeptical of the "bureaucratic" requirements. In addition, effective management will build credibility with the external agencies which are often indifferent toward the difficulties their requirements may be creating. Effective management of external funding, therefore, requires a knowledge and understanding of institutional policies and procedures ranging from indirect costs to curriculum development; of agency requirements and compliances ranging from cash depositories to procurement standards[1]; of accounting and auditing principles; as well as basic management techniques with supervision, delegation, time management, human relations, and group processes. The following practical suggestions will assist the grants administrator in establishing and operating an effective management system.

Ronald J. Etzel is Assistant Director of the Research Services Office at Bowling Green State University.

Appropriate Policies and Procedures

The purpose of policies and procedures for research and development activities is to facilitate rather than to control such projects. In order to maintain the balance and minimize the conflicts between the needs and demands of the faculty, central administration, and external agencies, policies must be clearly promulgated to the players.

The policies and procedures should be in writing and be widely endorsed by the institutional community. For instance, the institution can appoint a research and development advisory council composed of members of various segments of the institutional community. The council can assist in the identification of policy and procedural needs, develop a policy manual, and convene on an annual or semi-annual basis to review and revise policies and procedures that may require future development. The policies and procedures must not be too burdensome. They should be able to serve as guidelines to faculty and staff as to what needs to be considered in advance of proposal development, but should be flexible enough to accomodate review for exceptions caused by unique opportunities or peculiar requirements of an external agency. To the extent that the policies and procedures are carefully considered in advance and clearly explained to faculty and staff, they will make it easier to manage the external funding process.

The following are examples of the more critical policy and procedure areas, depending upon the volume and nature of external funding, all or some of which need to be addressed. One important element to keep in mind is that what may be an appropriate procedure for one institution may not be appropriate for another. There are certain items that need to be accomplished; how they are accomplished varies among institutions.

Indirect Costs

Indirect costs are generally controversial or confusing to grantee, grantor, and individual principal investigators. Indirect costs are real costs incurred by sponsored projects. Briefly defined, "*direct costs* are those which can be identified and charged to a specific project relatively easily with a reasonable degree of accuracy (e.g. direct salaries, materials, travel); *indirect costs* are those that have been incurred for purposes common to a number or all of the specific projects, programs, or activities of an institution but which cannot be identified and charged directly to such projects, programs, or activities relatively easily with a reasonable degree of accuracy and without an inordinate amount of accounting" (e.g. heating, lighting, general administrative services).[2]

The indirect cost policy must be clearly and carefully explained to principal investigators regardless of whether or not the institution has an audited-negotiated rate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or other agency.[3] A full knowledge and understanding of the applicable cost principles, as well as a consistent yet flexible procedure for their application and negotiation, are very important to the grants administrator in communicating with faculty.

Indirect costs, depending upon the computation factors mentioned above, may be allocated for depreciation or use allowances for building and equipment; operations and maintenance costs including utilities; departmental, student services, grants office, and general administration costs; as well as graduate student funding and internal research. The allocation of indirect costs, however, can create problems if they are not managed and communicated properly. For example, persons outside the institution (federal agencies and the general public) may develop an erroneous image of the institution making a profit from tax dollars. On the other hand, and perhaps more critical in the short-run, faculty members confused about indirect costs may feel that their efforts in capturing external dollars are being exploited by the institution. Such misunderstandings can damage internal and external relations.

The institution should alleviate any problems or misunderstandings by communciating the facts about indirect costs to faculty and staff. This can be accomplished via a section in a grants manual, a memorandum, periodic seminars with departments, and a grants administration staff that understands the factors and takes the time to explain them on an individual basis.

As a matter of policy, the institution will want to recover as much (if not all) of the negotiated rate on every external project. However, there must be flexibility because certain agencies mandate a specific rate other than the negotiated rate (e.g. training programs usually restrict the rate to a maximum of eight percent of total direct costs); the agency may require a certain percentage of cost-sharing or may limit the total award to a certain dollar amount, either of which may necessitate the institution to absorb part of the indirect costs; private foundations and corporate sponsors will rarely support more than 10 percent of indirect costs, if any. Thus, the grants manager needs a policy to cover the application of indirect costs and needs a flexible set of procedures from which to implement and communicate the details to his or her clients (i.e. faculty). A typical policy should include the following components: (1) the current institutional negotiated rate and the institutional official(s) authorized to approve other rates (it is suggested that the grants administrator be given this authority); (2) automatic exceptions when the external agency mandates a certain rate; (3) a priority listing of areas that should be used for cost-sharing, when necessary and feasible, with salaries and wages at the bottom of the list, particularly if the indirect cost rate is based on the salaries and wages; (4) the disposition of income generated by external funding.

The disposition of income is an item rarely disseminated by policy and procedure statements and awkwardly discussed at the faculty seminars conducted by the grants manager. This is unfortunate because the disposition of indirect costs is at the root of most problems the grants administrator will encounter. Some principal investigators remain convinced that it was the indirect costs of their projects which financed the athletic club's trip to Hawaii with the football team.

One solid policy to help alleviate this problem is to establish a percentage breakdown of where this income goes and to include percentage returns to the academic department of proposal origin and to the principal investigator. For instance, 15-25 percent of the indirect costs recovered from projects of members of "department X" could be returned to that department via an "overhead return account" stipulated to be used for support and promotion of research and development activities within the department. The specific use of the funds is left to the discretion of the department. In addition, one to five percent of the indirect costs could be returned to the principal investigator via an account with the grants office. These funds can be used at the discretion of the faculty member for paper presentations, publications costs, travel to sponsoring agencies, or other activities linked with research and development. It is also recommended that the grants office secure a three to five percent indirect cost set aside, above what may be allocated for operational costs, to be used as a development fund for the less prosperous departments to assist with R&D activities such as travel to meet program officers. The above policies can help to reduce the myths surrounding indirect costs, to help provide incentives to academic departments and principal investigators to develop external funding support, and to help meet emergency as well as promotional R&D financial needs. The extra administrative accounting cost to maintain the records is minimal and the potential in return benefit far exceeds the cost.

Cost-Sharing and Grant/Contract Financial Deficits

Many external sponsors require cost-sharing as a condition of the award. Institutions often follow a policy of promising cost-sharing (or matching of costs) only to the extent required by the sponsor. The grants manager needs to establish a clear policy which maintains consistency and control of cost-sharing resources. For example, if cost-sharing commitments are made indiscriminately beyond the minimum required by the agency, valuable cost-sharing resources (which may otherwise be available for other projects) may be tied up unnecessarily. On the other hand, however, a policy to obligate only the minimum amount of cost-sharing required must be flexible enough to accommodate those projects which are confined to a maximum external amount of dollars (mandated by the agency) and thus require internal support above the minimum cost-sharing percentage.

It is rare to find a project which has been funded because of extra cost-sharing on the part of the institution; a safe policy to follow is one of minimum cost-sharing to meet sponsor requirements. In order to accommodate the exceptional projects, it is a good idea to develop a priority listing of cost-sharing areas to serve as a guideline for the principal investigator. For instance, the institution may be able to absorb computer time or graduate assistant tuition and fees easier than secretarial salaries or travel expenses; released time for faculty may be more available in the history department than in the chemistry department. Thus the grants administrator, in addition to basic knowledge about the institution's resource situation, can develop and communicate a priority ranking of cost-sharing areas such as:

- computer time
- tuition and fee payments
- communications
- printing and duplicating

- postage
- equipment (except when sponsor has special requirement)
- subject fees
- expendable supplies
- consultant and contract services
- travel
- indirect costs
- salaries and wages.

The above items, however, can only be viewed as examples because each project will have different factors influencing the budget development process. Such a policy should aid the principal investigator in thinking through the budget and obtaining proper clearances from departments and colleges prior to the final budget work sessions with the grants manager.

Closely aligned to the cost-sharing policies is the need for procedures to handle cost overruns or grant/contract deficits. Another good reason for a policy of minimum cost-sharing commitments is the occasional need to absorb deficits as institutional cost-sharing. If an extraordinary amount has already been committed to the project, it may be difficult to absorb a cost overrun if the situation so dictates. (And auditors to trail cost-sharing obligations.)

A standard procedure for handling such deficits would be as follows, in order of priority steps taken: (1) request additional support from the funding agency; (2) request permission to transfer monies from another grant budget line; (3) absorb deficit as additional institutional cost-sharing; (4) somehow live within the budget.

Classified Research and Development

Some institutions follow a policy of refusing to accept grants and contracts which carry limitations concerning the dissemination and publication of results. An institution may include in the R&D policy statement something to the effect that it is "dedicated to the free and open pursuit of knowledge and unrestricted dissemination of the results of its investigations for the benefit of all " Such a policy may prohibit the conduct of classified research and development as well as access to classified information except in cases of a national emergency.

On the other hand, some institutions do accept classified grants and contracts for the reason that the advancement of knowledge may be impaired if such work is not accomplished. Often, however, they will attempt to control these projects by limiting the number of projects, by limiting such projects to certain disciplines, by permitting only a few faculty to hold security clearances, or by agreement only to defer publications for a certain period of time.

In addition to the "national security" reasoning, other types of classified research may include personal papers restricted by a person's last will, a government agency fearful of criticisim once results are known, or an industrial sponsor seeking to protect a potential trade secret.

Thus the institution must decide in advance to what extent, if any, it will permit involvement in classified research and development and to what extent it will relinquish its rights to publish freely. From a practical standpoint, the grants manager must have a policy to communicate and explain to the faculty in order to provide proper advice for an endeavor that may not be acceptable and to be able to negotiate an arrangement with a sponsor that will be in accord with institutional interests. For example, beware of the seemingly innocent clause which binds results "only to be published with approval of the agency."

Transfer of Equipment

Although there may be exceptions, equipment acquired through grant or contract funds generally becomes the property of the institution. Most principal investigators become very possessive with grant awards and subsequent budget items. On the other hand, without the institutional affiliation they probably would not have been eligible for the award and it just would not make sense having individual investigators owning various pieces of equipment. However, the value of certain equipment to research efforts, particularly if the equipment has been specifically or uniquely designed, may be beyond a dollar amount and critically detrimental should it be separated from the project and investigator. Thus, during the application stage or the award acceptance stage, the funding agency, the institution, and the principal investigator must agree where the title to the equipment will be vested and the policies and procedures concerning the disposition of the equipment.

The institution must have a policy that considers the potential detrimental effects of separating a researcher from the necessary equipment. This needs to be considered for investigators transferring both to and from the institution. For the former, most of the decision depends upon the policies of the institution he/she is transferring from. The institution receiving the equipment needs to be concerned with the costs of transfer, the space and arrangements, and any purchase costs that may be involved. For the latter, the following factors need to be considered:

- the status of the grant or contract (transfer is easier and more favorably considered if the grant is still in effect or if such a transfer will not cause a premature termination of the grant)
- the uniqueness of the equipment to the grant (if the equipment is not unique or if it is relatively easy to obtain, then the argument to transfer will be weak)
- the cost-sharing that may have been involved in the original purchase (the institution should be reimbursed by the receiving institution for the amount of cost-sharing cash outlay minus depreciation)
- the impact on the instructional or research efforts of the department involved (in the decision whether or not to release the equipment, the institution must consider any impact upon the department's instructional and on-going research efforts. That is, the request by a faculty member to transfer a piece of equipment should be favorably considered only if it has no bearing on the programming of the department)
- the costs involved with the movement of the equipment (the institution receiving the

equipment should pay the moving costs or charge to the grant if appropriate).

Conflicts of Interest

There are two major types of conflicts to be avoided: favoring of outside interests and outside consulting as it may conflict with external agencies or their contractors.

When an employee of the institution engaged in sponsored work has a financial interest in or a consulting arrangement with a private business concern, it is important to avoid actual or apparent conflicts of interest between the sponsored obligations, institutional obligations, and the outside interest and obligations. Such conflicts of interest could manifest themselves in a variety of ways:

- the project designer serving the needs of the private firm without disclosure of such to the institution and the sponsoring agency
- purchase of equipment, supplies, materials, or other items from the private firm without disclosure of such transmission to the private firm, or other use of personal gain, of sponsored work products, materials, records, or other items that are not otherwise made generally available
- use for personal gain or unauthorized use of privileged information acquired in connection with the sponsored project
- the use of influencing on the negotiation of subcontracts between the sponsored project and the private concern
- acceptance of gratuities or special favors from a private concern, under circumstances which may be interpreted as an attempt to influence the recipient, that is, negotiating business with the institution in regard to the sponsored project.

The second major conflict to avoid is outside consulting when, and if, it may conflict with a sponsored project. There are at least three good reasons for outside consulting and for the institution to protect the opportunities for faculty members to consult: (1) research horizons can be broadened and research capabilities improved from outside relationships; (2) the faculty member is expected to benefit and develop, particularly in the applied areas, from association with business, industry, or government that may be expected to employ one's students; (3) the opportunity to earn additional income. On the other hand, care must be taken to avoid conflicts with outside consulting in two areas; the faculty member engaged in sponsored research who also serves as a consultant to a federal agency, and outside consulting and distribution of effort. For example, when a faculty member consults for one or more contracts, particularly when it is in the same area as one's own sponsored project, caution must be exercised to avoid challenges of questionable objectivity because of an influence of private interests. Problems can arise particularly if there is a financial interest of the faculty member at stake and such disclosure has not been made.

At most institutions, a faculty member is permitted to engage in a reasonable amount of external consulting or business interests outside of the institution providing that such activities do not interfere with the regular duties and responsibilities. There are various types of policies and arrangements practiced by institutions. Many limit external consulting to a certain number of days or a theoretical percentage of time; some require only that a dean or department head be kept informed about such activities; and some have no policy or procedure at all. One of the most popular policies is to limit outside consulting to one day per week. Such provisions are usually written ambiguously and thus interpreted according to the motivating interests involved. For instance, does one day per week mean one day per work week or one day per calendar week (thus in addition to Saturday and Sunday) or as a cumulative figure of 52 plus Saturdays and Sundays. So far as sponsored research is concerned, the federal government would prefer that the institution handle its own policies and procedures for outside consulting.[4]

The federal government is more concerned with the effect that outside consulting may have on the actual time base at which it is being charged a percentage of a certain faculty member's time. For instance, if faculty member A is charged to grant X for 20 percent time does that mean 20 percent of the faculty member's base time (e.g. one day or eight hours per week) or does that mean 20 percent of time available less other outside consulting commitments (the amount permitted by the institution) which could mean 6.4 or 4.8 hours per week. Thus, the percentage-base method has definitive meaning only when the base of internal time available is defined. The federal government's problem can be further compounded if the faculty member's name also appears on proposals from other institutions.

There are competing demands placed on the energies of a faculty member (teaching, research, committee work, community service, as well as outside consulting). The way in which a faculty member divides one's time does not create problems unless the sponsoring agency has been misled concerning the amount of time actually to be devoted to the project. To further complicate the matter, a system of precise time accounting is incompatible with the nature of the faculty member's work because the work performed is very closely related and does not conform to any precise division of a work week. Nevertheless, the successful research grant or contract needs to demonstrate a relationship between the indicated efforts of responsibility and the actual extent of involvement.

Compliances—Protection of Rights and Welfare

The research or grants office often has the responsibility to ensure compliance with regulations pertaining to human subjects, animal care, copyrights, and patents. The most effective way to accomplish this is by using committees which are often required as part of the compliance.

Human Subjects

The institution receiving sponsored support must protect the rights and welfare of all human beings in research or related activities. The federal government will not accept a grant or contract application unless the project has been reviewed and approved by the appropriate institutional committee charged with the protection of human subjects. The institution must submit an assurance of compliance with human subjects policy[5] and agree to monitor the project continually before the sponsoring agency completes its award decision review. In recent years, all federal agencies have become increasingly concerned about the protection of human subjects in experimental studies.

The institutional review process must be designed to determine that the rights of human subjects are adequately protected and that the risks to an individual are outweighed by the potential benefits to him or by the importance of the knowledge to be gained. Step one, then, is for the institution to appoint a human subjects review committee or charge an existing committee with such responsibility. The institution should adopt a statement of principles to assist the committee in discharging its responsibilities.[6]

The committee should review and approve all research proposals including grants, contracts, traineeships, thesis and dissertation support, and faculty fellowships prior to signature by institutional officials and submission for external funding. Often, however, the deadlines will not permit this review prior to submission. In such cases, the application can be submitted with human subjects review and approval taking place as soon as possible after submission. Since the human subjects review committee is an advisory group for the institution, the grants office should assist with as much of the administrative detail as possible.

There are two important items to be completed by the committee and maintained in a human subjects file in addition to the minutes of committee meetings and correspondence: first, an approval form signed by each committee member for every project reviewed by the committee; and second, a consent form signed by the subject, when human subjects are participants in the project. The file should be maintained in the grants office along with the institutional copies of all external applications.

It is helpful for the grants office to use an application form or similar format to present the required information to the committee for review. Such a format allows the review process to proceed efficiently according to the following stages: (1) initiation by the principal investigator with the research or grants office; (2) review and approval by the human subjects committee or subcommittee thereof; (3) notification of the principal investigator; (4) notification of the funding agency.

Animal Care

Laboratory research animals play a vital role in many research projects. Accordingly, the institution has an obligation to insure that proper care and treatment is afforded these animals. Federal regulations provide guidelines for transportation, purchase, sale, housing, care, handling, and treatment of research animals. The Department of Agriculture, the agency charged with the responsibility for administering the regulations, requires that animal care facilities be so registered. In order to obtain registration, the institution must assure USDA that adequate veterinary care is provided, that the facilities are appropriate, and that operating standards are sufficient.

Institutions can apply for animal care accreditation which is accepted by the National Institutes of Health as meeting their policy on laboratory animals.[7] In order to be eligible for accreditation, and in order to meet NIH policy, institutions must establish animal care committees, much like the human subjects committee, to set standards, review proposals, approve the use of animals, and conduct follow-up monitoring.

Thus, as with the human subjects, the first place to start is with the institution appointing an animal care committee (including a local veterinarian) and establishing specific standards and principles. Again it is recommended that the principal investigator get an early start with the grants manager in developing the proposal to assure that the animal involvement will be in accord with legal requirements. A checklist format should cover the following areas as the critical review factors: (1) arrangements for breeding or acquisition of the animals; (2) supervisory and animal caretaking personnel and procedures; (3) facilities; (4) design of the project or activity; (5) significance of the research.

Animal care facilities should be under the direction of a veterinarian whose responsibility includes the training of support staff. The animal care committee should consider such hazards as the transmission of diseases between animals and people. Thus the principal investigator must plan on the availability of supervisory and animal-handling personnel early in the design of the project. The project design itself must assure that the animals will not be subjected to extraordinary or unnecessary injury or suffering.[8]

As with human subjects review procedures, the grants office should assist the committee in discharging its responsibility. The method of using a returnable signature/approval page, and following the same process of initiation by the principal investigator with the research or grants office, review and approval by the animal care committee, and notification of the principal investigator and funding agency is suggested as sufficient and expedient.

Copyrights and Patents

The United States Constitution states that "the Congress shall have power . . . to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." A copyright covers the form or manner in which an idea is expressed. Thus "a copyright is a grant to an author of the exclusive right, subject to certain limitations, to reproduce copies of a copyrighted work, to prepare derivative works, to distribute copies, and to perform or display audiovisual works publicly." A patent covers the idea itself; "a patent is a grant to an inventor by the government of the right to exclude others for a limited time from making, using, or selling his or her invention in the country where the patent is granted."

There are three key questions that need to be considered and answered in any copyright and patent policy: ownership and disclosure; distribution of royalty income; and compliance with

10

the requirements of sponsored research. The institution must first resolve the ownership question. Should the institution take title to patentable inventions and copyrightable material or should it only control and approve the assignment or licensing of such? Inventions resulting from academic research should be made available to the public. Because most academic institutions are not designed to develop and market inventions, the licensing to commercial enterprises must be considered within the patent policy. Typically, the institution will have faculty, staff, and graduate students (often only in academic areas with patentable invention potential) sign an agreement when they are hired or when they embark on research projects which:

- obligates compliance with the policy which states who owns or controls the title
- indicates the percentage (or other method) shares distribution of royalties or other income and the rational thereof
- requires prompt disclosure of inventions
- requires disclosure of income realized from copyrighted materials whose preparation required significant institutional costs above the normal provisions (salary, office space)
- requires compliance with the requirements of sponsored research.

It is good policy to provide recognition and incentive to inventors and authors by making their share in any royalties significant. The inventor's share often is approximately 50 percent of the net income earned for those inventions, although frequently the percentage is scaled down in subsequent years as the income from an invention may tend to increase. Agreements on the distribution of royalty income are usually based upon the degree to which institutional funds and facilities are utilized. In developing a percentage return on royalties, the grants manager must consider royalties as the result of extraordinary funds or facilities provided by the institution (beyond regular salary, office space, equipment; e.g., a cost-sharing on a sponsored project); and situations where no extra funds or facilities were committed. It may be easier to implement a policy with copyrights by simply requiring reimbursement of the extra university funds with the author receiving the income above that amount. In any case, it is also very good policy to include in the written agreement a statement and method of returning any net income the institution realizes (institutional royalty share less cost-sharing investment less patent/copyright administrative expenses) back to support scholarly activities. It is suggested that these monies be returned to the department or program of record.

All sponsors of research (government, industrial, and sometimes private) have requirements concerning patents resulting from their funded grants or contracts. It is best for the institution to have its patent policy approved by the sponsoring agency and then enter into a patent agreement with that agency to cover inventions made under research projects sponsored by the agency. Copyrights are usually issued to the author, or to his or her assignee, by payment of a nominal sum and registration of the copyright with the U.S. Copyright Office. At times the copyright, or right to copyright, is assigned to the publisher. When external sponsors are involved, the principal investigator should find out in advance what requirements will prevail.

In addition to developing and implementing the institution's patent policy, the grants manager should be up to date on the process of disclosing, patenting, and licensing an invention and have clear procedures in order to guide or assist the principal investigator in the following steps: (1) prompt and proper disclosure of an invention; (2) invention evaluation to determine patentability; (3) filing of a patent application; (4) location and negotiation of licenses; (5) monitoring of the licensee.

Depending upon the volume of inventions and the capabilities of the grants office or other internal staff (patent expertise and time commitments), it may be easier and less costly for the institution to assign inventions to one of the patent management organizations (e.g., University Patents, Inc.) which will enter into an agreement with the institution and handle the disclosing, patenting, and licensing requirements for a royalty share with the institution.

Liaison with the Business Office

The grants manager plays a critical liaison role with the institution's business office. The management of external funding requires a solid working relationship with the fiscal managers of the institution. Depending upon the size of the institution and the volume of external funding, there may or may not be a separate staff to handle the restricted fund accounting and other business service needs. In addition to a general knowledge of business functions, the best tools for the grants manager are patience, understanding, kindness, consideration, and a budget with which to take the accountant and purchasing agent out to dinner at least once each year. The grants administrator will undoubtedly need to make special requests and place certain demands upon the business function and the grants office will need to maintain solid lines of communication in so doing.

The external project budget authority should always remain with the principal investigator/project director. The grants manager should only act as liaison and provider of coordinating service, thus reinforcing the principal investigators' sense of budget responsibility for the project.

Accounting

The primary functions of the accounting system concerning external funding are the following: (1) establishment of accounts; (2) methods of recording costs and commitments; (3) computation of indirect cost rates; (4) reporting of costs; (5) payment of salaries and other costs; and (6) billing and collection of funds from sponsors. As a grants manager you need to be familiar with the principles and procedures of the above functions necessary to meet the demands of grantees and grantors. Unfortunately, business office personnel occasionally need to be reminded that a good accounting system should be built to fit the institutional needs rather then fitting the institution to meet the accounting system. Thus, it is a good idea to be prepared to offer suggestions and alternative methods for satisfying the demands.

The business office needs to be knowledgeable about the general nature of the projects being sponsored by external support and, of course, the various accounting needs (usually special needs) of different projects. The grants manager therefore has a special obligation to ensure that proper coordination takes place with the business office particularly if the volume of external funding does not warrant a separate grants/research accountant and staff.

The first step in the coordinating process is to develop with the business office the various budget development factors to be used in grant and contract proposals. It is desirable, of course, to keep these rates in line with the regular institutional rates. All proposal submissions should include coordination with the business office for a final budget check, with file copies provided for the business office.

The second step is coordination of the awards notice, final budget adjustment, if necessary, and activation of the account. The business office is responsible for four primary tasks: (1) establishment of accounts with distinct coding for each external project; (2) adequate documentation for the direct costs and cost-sharing of projects; (3) indirect cost rates and overhead return (it is best to charge and dispose of overhead charges on a monthly basis as they are earned); (4) accurate, up-to-date, and frequent (at least monthly) financial reports to principal investigators and the grants office (depending upon the extent of the monitoring function).

The business office (accounting) can activate the project by assigning an account number. Depending upon the accounting system, a good idea is to assign the department/division budget number and a distinct cost number which will satisfy the requirements for identification and facilitate the cost-sharing trail. In addition, a helpful procedure is for the business office to disseminate the activation notice by preparing, in coordination with the grants office, a one-page essential information memorandum to all offices that may be directly or indirectly requested to provide service. For instance, the activation notice may include the following information: the title of the project; the grantor and identification number; the total dollar amount; the budget and cost numbers; the project director and department; the effective dates of the award; a brief abstract of the project; etc. Copies of the above would then be sent to several areas in order to alert personnel to the award.

The third step would include an orientation meeting with the key accounting personnel, the grants administrator, and the principal investigator/project director. This meeting should include a review of budgetary policies and procedures, a review of any special requirements with the particular sponsor, appropriate responsibilities of each area, as well as a question and answer session. The scope of the orientation meeting will vary according to the experience of the principal investigator. The meeting should be designed to serve several purposes: (1) the faculty member may have had little, if any, contact with the business office, thus, such a meeting would serve to personalize the relationship; (2) the faculty member could be relieved of any administrative worries and, thus, get on with the substance of the project; (3) the sense of responsibilities could be further reinforced and a clear line of communication would be open to solve any future problems.

Thus, the role of the grants manager will be that of trouble-shooter, mediator, and facilitator between the business office/accounting function and the principal investigators as need arises. The grants manager may also act as the chief advisor with the sponsor in regard to project budget-change requests and other details. The key to success, if there is one, is a strong sense of "service" responsibility on the part of the grants manager.

Purchasing

Externally-funded projects often place extra and different demands upon the purchasing functions: (1) usually "needed yesterday" constraints, caused by award notice delays, unknown needs (normal for new and particularly experimental projects), and generally tight performance deadlines; (2) often in quantities smaller than what regular purchasing policies may dictate; and (3) often highly specialized requiring search beyond the regular institutional vendors.

The institution's purchasing procedures and purchasing staff may not be designed to meet the extraordinary needs and requirements of sponsored projects. The cost of lost time and frustration could damage an otherwise excellent project. This is one reason why some institutions have opted for an affiliated foundation to handle the management of external funding in order to establish the separate systems and to avoid the handicap of too rigid or state-imposed business regulations which may conflict with sponsored project needs.

The grants manager can handle this first by communicating with the purchasing office staff and explain why life is the way it is. The grants manager may be surprised to find that once the purchasing staff as well as other business office staff understands why certain requests must be handled differently than others and that the grants office will assist in designing and implementing appropriate procedures, service can improve and most demands can be satisfied.

The same principles hold true for the other institutional offices of supporting services and facilities. The grants manager must assume the liaison role and work toward the balance. Once the manager establishes credibility as a representative of each office's needs, solutions will be found. If not, the reason may be the volume of external projects and, if that is the case, then a strong argument can be made to expand certain staffs to handle the external projects.

Submission Procedures and Project Start-Up Assistance

Another management responsibility of the grants office is coordination, the submission of external proposals and assistance with the start-up of external awards. Key aspects in this area are routing procedures and institutional approvals, technical requirements and record keeping, and award notice follow-up.

The grants manager must establish very clear and consistent procedures for the submission of external proposals; every person submitting an external proposal should know in advance what procedures to follow. Most of the time the principal investigator will have previously been in contact with the grants office for development assistance and thus have received a reminder, or the investigator will know from past experience the procedures required. Nevertheless, a grants manager should always be prepared for the proposal that appears at the last minute with various details that need completion prior to submission. It is much easier to plan than panic by disseminating the submission procedures as widely as possible.

Make certain that every department, division, or program of the institution receives something in writing concerning submission requirements at least once each year. Many grant offices publish a program information handbook at the beginning of each academic year, which updates submission procedures and describes various grant programs, opportunities, and deadlines. Another very good method is to use an internal routing and approval form.

Ideally, one full week should be allowed for internal review and processing. In reality, however, it may be rare to have a full week to accomplish the reviews. Nevertheless, by conditioning each office to respond quickly (using color-coded folders, hand-carrying, making sure everything is in proper order) the review and approvals can be accomplished in as little time as an hour or two.

Technical Requirements and Record Keeping

The grants management function must also be concerned with technical requirements and recordkeeping. The staff must be prepared to give advice and assistance to proposal writers concerning various requirements of funding agencies such as typing formats, composition requirements, duplicating requirements, mailing instructions, application kits, forms and cards, as well as the information required therein that may be unfamiliar to most faculty members.

Most principal investigators will need assistance completing at least 24 items of information required therein because it is institutional data ordinarily not at the fingertips of faculty members. Thus, the grants office, which can quickly complete these items for faculty members, will facilitate the process, allow the investigator more time to concentrate on the narrative, and thereby, encourage involvement with grants development because of the efficient and professional assistance provided. It is also essential to maintain a frequently updated program/agency guideline file which contains several copies of current application instructions and necessary forms. In addition, the grants office should be the office responsible for maintaining a proposal master file for the official institutional recordkeeping requirements. Thus, for any subsequent questions or informational needs (which may occur as many as five years or more after submission) as well as for resubmission consideration of rejected proposals, there will be a central location and file which contains all the pertinent information.

Once an award decision is made by the funding agency, either one of two responsibilities should be coordinated by the grants/research administrator: (1) if the proposal has been rejected, the grants manager should encourage and assist the principal investigator in obtaining reviewer comments, conducting a review session identifying weaknesses and considering resubmission, and assisting the investigator in making a personal visit to the agency for further review; (2) if an award has been made, the grants manager should assist the investigator with the project start-up details.

Project Management

The management of projects is generally the responsibility of the principal investigator, although some grants offices get heavily involved in activities such as public relations, promotion, monitoring, evaluation, accounting, and reporting. The nature and scope of involvement depends upon the individual institutional situations. As a minimum, the grants manager should provide the following start-up services:

- firming of the grant/contract award notice and final budget with the agency and the institutional business office
- securing of any agency fiscal and progress reporting forms and requirements, including review of such with the principal investigator
- notification of all offices directly and indirectly concerned with the award by developing a summary abstract (in addition to other pertinent information such as budget number, dates of award, names and identification numbers) which can be the basis for internal and external news releases
- providing information and coordinating contact with others necessary services such as accounting, purchasing, personnel, publications, computer services, admissions, news services, and other arrangements that may be required
- preliminary planning for grant renewal and follow-up opportunities.

It is a good idea to encourage the principal investigator to contact the grants office with any problems or changes that may occur during the project. The grants manager may want to schedule periodic follow-ups on projects to assure that both the agency and the institution are satisfied with the progress and accomplishment of results. The grants office that is one step ahead of potential problems or misunderstandings is the grants office which maintains a strong performance credibility for the institution in its relations with external agencies.

Conclusion

In conclusion, balanced management of external funding requires a solid rapport with academic departments and principal investigators. A good way to accomplish this, depending upon the size of the institution and the size of the grants office staff, is to have each staff person responsible for certain institutional departments and programs and thus create a "client-centered environment." Grants/research administration, like other areas of academic administration, is subject to varying levels of skepticism on the part of the faculty. Thus, it is very important that the management of external funding be accomplished efficiently, with time allocated for personal department visits, laboratory visits, and demonstrations of sincere interest in the projects and investigators. The management of external funding is much more than a "super paperwork" business; it is, foremost, a "people" business.

FOOTNOTES:

[1] Office of Management and Budget Circular, OMB A-110.

[2] "Indirect Costs in Universities," NACUBO, 1976.

[3] For cost principles and computation, see Office of Management and Budget Circular, OMB A-21.

[4] Office of Management and Budget Circular, OMB A-21, current regulation and the revision under consideration.

[5] HEW Ford 596, "Protection of Human Subjects/Assurance/Certification/Declaration."

[6] Two helpful publications in establishing and operating institutional review committees are: (1) U.S. Government Printing Office, "The Institutional Guide to HEW Policy on Protection of Human Subjects," No. (NIH) 1740-0326, Superintendent of Documents, GPO, Washington, DC 20402, and (2) American Psychological Association, "Ethical Principles in the Conduct of Research With Human Participants," 1200 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

[7] American Association for Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care, 4 East Clinton, Joliet, IL 60434.

[8] A good reference is the "Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals," No. (HEW) 1740-0343, Superintendent of Documents, GPO, Washington, DC 20402.

The Faculty

GRANTS:
VIEWS
FROM
THE
CAMPUS

Dorothy A. Frayer

Communicating with Faculty

A vital aspect of the work of the grants officer is communicating with faculty—letting them know of potential grant support. Two major difficulties are inherent in this task: first, assuring that information reaches all faculty who might be interested in a given opportunity, and second, disseminating information to faculty at a date sufficiently prior to the deadline to allow development of a strong proposal. This section will offer suggestions for an effective communication program which overcomes these difficulties. Two principles underlie all of these suggestions: (1) communication is a two-way street—it is as important for you to learn of faculty interests as it is to inform them about grant opportunities; and (2) grantsgetting should be viewed as the seeking of support for desired program development or research rather than as merely a response to availability of funds.

Attending Departmental Meetings

An excellent way of establishing communication with faculty is to attend departmental meetings. In this small group context, you can learn of departmental and individual interests in program development or research. You can also describe grant opportunities which are likely to be of special interest to members of the department. Finally, you can describe the services of the grants office and explain the way in which you would like to work with faculty in seeking grants. Department meetings provide an effective means for learning of faculty interests, disseminating information about grant opportunities, and describing the services of the grants office. Although each of these objectives can be met through informal interchange alone, materials can be prepared to make these interchanges more fruitful and to increase the probability of long-range effects. These materials include faculty interest questionnaires, lists of grant opportunities by area, and guidelines for grant submission.

Faculty Interest Questionnaires. As you discuss the interests of the department and of individual faculty members, you may distribute a questionnaire to each faculty member to be com-

---

Dorothy A. Frayer is Executive Director of Grants, Contracts, and Research Administration at Hofstra University.

pleted at the meeting or afterward and returned to the grants office. This questionnaire might ask faculty members to describe briefly their interests in the areas of program development, research, and professional development. An example of a questionnaire and an appropriate cover letter is included as Appendix A.

Distribution and completion of such a questionnaire accomplishes several purposes. First, the formulation of the questionnaire in terms of categories directs the faculty member's attention to the range of grant support available. Second, the file of completed questionnaires provides a basis for systematic follow-up with faculty regarding their interests. Third, the solicitation of information communicates your interest and your intention to assist faculty members in attaining their personal goals.

This type of information, updated from time to time, will alert you to faculty members with interests atypical of their discipline. For example, at our university there is a historian whose major interest is in wildlife conservation. A business professor has done work in nonverbal communication and is doing research on its role in susceptibility to assault. In such cases, it would be unlikely that you would forward appropriate information without this personal knowledge of the faculty member's special interests.

Once they have been received, questionnaires may be used in two ways. You may refer to them to determine which faculty members may be interested in information about a particular program. Alternatively, as time becomes available, you may use the questionnaire as an entree to meet with the faculty member and explore possible sources of funding for a given area of interest.

Lists of Grant Opportunities by Subject Matter Area. Another useful resource which can be used in departmental meetings is a list of grant opportunities by subject matter area. This list may have sections of varying specifity ranging from "General" (e.g., Women's Educational Equity) to "Natural Sciences and Social Sciences" (e.g., National Science Foundation's Undergraduate Research Participation Program) to "Special Education" (e.g., Bureau of Education for the Handicapped Personnel Preparation Program). Sections relevant to a particular department may be distributed to each member of that department a week prior to your meeting with them. Request that faculty look through the listing before the meeting so that they can raise questions about opportunities of special interest.

Listings may be brief, consisting of the program name, the sponsoring agency, and a brief description of the type of support available. The list should include as wide a range of opportunities as possible, including program development, research, and faculty development. A collation of these listings may be maintained in the grants office for reference.

Preparation of these lists has benefits for both you and the faculty. For you it provides a review of the opportunities relevant for a given department, perhaps leading to suggested undertakings. For the faculty member, it suggests the universe of funding opportunities. Also, it enables the faculty to make better use of the meeting time by providing background information and a focus for questions.

Guidelines for Grant Submission. Faculty often have inaccurate and widely differing perceptions of the functions of the grants office. Some may believe that they need only suggest a topic in a sentence or two and the grants office will produce from that suggestion a full proposal. Others may be completely unaware of the grants office and believe that they simply turn a proposal in to an agency on a personal basis.

Discussion, in the meeting, of the way in which you would like to work with faculty can be quite helpful in correcting misperceptions. This discussion can be reinforced by distribution of a brief summary of guidelines for grant submission. Guidelines might include a list of services offered by the grants office, a description of clearances which are necessary for proposals, how long prior to a deadline a grant should be submitted to the grants office (and why!). A supply of these guidelines can also be kept on hand in the grants office and given to a faculty member when an initial meeting takes place about a prospective proposal.

In the preceding section, three types of materials were described which can heighten the effectiveness of meetings with faculty. Each of these materials can be used outside the context of departmental meetings. Experience has shown, however, that questionnaires which are simply mailed to faculty have a low probability of return. Similarly, guidelines and lists which are mailed seem to be subject to burial amidst stacks of other papers on the faculty member's desk and have little impact.

In summary, department meetings are a superb means of establishing face-to-face contact with faculty who might otherwise not seek to discuss grant possibilities. The effectiveness of these meetings may be enchanced by the use of informative materials and questionnaires. Meetings may be held with offices such as student services as well as with academic departments.

Sending Information Via Memo

Grants officers frequently send memos to deans or department chairpersons informing them of grant opportunities and ask them to pass this information on to appropriate faculty. This is, however, a highly ineffective approach. Departments may meet infrequently and the pressure of other business may mean that the information is not passed on. Even if the information *is* communicated, precious time may be lost until the dean or chairperson has time to attend to the matter or until a meeting is held. As a result, it may be too late to prepare a strong, well-developed proposal.

A better approach is to send information of potential interest to a targetted portion of the faculty, in memo form, directly to the faculty members involved. Copies may be sent to deans and chairpersons to assure that they are kept informed and can encourage faculty to apply when appropriate.

Distribution of these memos may be simplified by sending the proper number of copies to each department mentioned in the memo, with a request that the departmental secretary place a copy in each faculty member's mailbox.

Publishing Information in a Newsletter

Many grant opportunities are of potential interest to a wide range of faculty. These opportunities can be described in a college or university newsletter if there is one published on your campus. Our newsletter has a regular feature, "Grant Opportunities." Items publicized by this means are only those of wide interest (e.g., Fulbright-Hays Fellowships, Earthwatch Field Research Support); memos are used for opportunities of interest to only a few departments, since the personal approach seems to be especially effective.

If your campus does not have a newsletter or if you would like to distribute more information than will fit in the somewhat limited space usually available, you may consider publishing a grants office newsletter on a regular basis.

Speaking at a Faculty Meeting

A good way of motivating faculty to consider developing grant proposals is to seek an invitation to talk to a meeting of the full faculty. The speaker of the faculty at our university was quite convinced of the importance of grants. To dramatize the possibility of success in obtaining grant support he introduced me at a faculty meeting by saying that, "Based on past experience, one out of every two of you who pass through the doorway of the grants office can expect to be successful in obtaining funds to carry out your ideas." (Our office has a 50 percent success rate.) Many faculty who had assumed that grants were almost impossible to obtain became quite attentive. In my talk, I described the benefits of grant support to the university and to the individual, provided statistics on grant activity at the university, and gave information about services of the grants office. Since our faculty meetings are conducted *by* faculty *for* faculty, this implied their endorsement of this activity.

Engaging Faculty in Identifying Grant Sources

Seek to create active participation by faculty not only in the development of proposals, but in discovering grant sources. Through professional journals or personal contacts, faculty may become aware of grant opportunities. Request that they let you know of these potential funding sources. Even though they may not wish to apply, the opportunity may be of interest to other faculty.

Raising Grants Awareness

Announce every grant received through appropriate means, such as the campus newsletter. This not only gives recognition to faculty who are successful in obtaining grants, but heightens the awareness of other faculty that grant opportunities exist. In such an announcement, you might mention not only the project director, funding source and amount, but also briefly describe the project and what kinds of support the funds will provide (e.g., released time, equipment, consultants, travel, student assistants). After a year of such publicity, I have discovered many faculty saying, "If they can do it, why can't I?"

In summary, there are many ways of communicating with faculty. Some approaches are aimed at learning *from* faculty of their interests and of potential grant sources; others are aimed at providing information *to* faculty of potential grant sources, of the services of the grants office, and of the likelihood of success in obtaining a grant. These approaches will help you be seen as an ally to faculty in bringing their ideas to fruition rather than as an alien "fundraiser."

Tutoring Faculty in Grantsgetting

Most grants officers would agree that there are identifiable skills which improve the likelihood of success in obtaining grants. Many faculty members who have excellent, fundable ideas have not yet developed these skills and, therefore, diminish their chance of success. An important goal of the grants office is to develop these skills through individual contacts, workshops, and reference materials.

Developing Skills Through Individual Work With Faculty

Frequently a faculty member may have an idea for a grant proposal which is not sufficiently developed. It is important that the idea be more fully developed before funding is sought. Your experience in "concretizing" ideas can facilitate this process. You might raise questions such as "For what purposes would funds be needed?" "What staff would be needed for the program?" "What approvals would be required before program implementation?" "What tasks would need to be carried out to implement the program?" "What would be a realistic schedule for completing these tasks?" This idea development will usually involve other faculty members and administrators, who can provide helpful suggestions. Through this process it will also become clear whether the idea is feasible and is compatible with the needs and goals of your school. When funding is sought, you will be able to be more convincing regarding the need for your program, its merit, and the support required.

When the idea of a faculty member has been sufficiently developed, you will want to assist the faculty member in identifying funding sources for that idea. Provide relevant program booklets and guidelines. Explain how to use reference sources such as the *Foundation Directory, Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance,* and the *Annual Register of Grant Support* to identify additional sources of funding. Suggest that they view the project from as many perspectives as possible—the subject matter area, population served, the outcomes expected—in order to broaden the funding possibilities. Encourage the faculty member to make personal contact with the agencies identified, and describe the kind of questions which might be asked (e.g., Is money available for the type of project the faculty member is proposing? Will funds be available during the next fiscal year? What is the anticipated deadline? Would the agency be willing to review or comment on a preliminary proposal? If they cannot fund such a project, do they know of another agency which might?) I often find it helpful to make one such phone call while the faculty member is in my office. This reduces the apprehension of calling and models the kind of questions to be asked. Usually faculty are amazed to find how much useful information can be obtained within a few minutes' time.

When you and the faculty member have agreed on the funding source(s) to be pursued, discuss the kinds of information to be included in the draft of a proposal. For example, in the case of a federal agency you may point out the need to be responsive to each and every criterion, perhaps identifying the information related to a criterion by means of a subheading. Describe how "timelines" can be developed and displayed. Explain the need for current and complete vitae, oriented toward the qualifications for the project to be undertaken. Suggest that a brief summary of qualifications for each project participant be included in the text, even if complete vitae are provided in an appendix. Point out the possibility of obtaining letters of support for the project. Emphasize the need for detail in describing project activities.

In addition to suggesting information to be included in a draft proposal, give guidance regarding technical details (e.g., What schedule is realistic for completing the proposal? Who will do the typing? What clearances are necessary?) A copy of the "Guidelines for Grant Submission," described earlier, may be given to the faculty member at this time for reference.

Encourage the faculty member to have the proposal draft reviewed by other faculty from his/her area. This is especially helpful if the readers have previously served on review panels.

If a proposal is rejected, encourage the faculty member to seek feedback, preferably in the form of reviewers' comments, and explain how to obtain these comments. When feedback is received, review the comments with the faculty member to determine if the proposal might be revised and resubmitted. In this way, rejection becomes not an endpoint but a part of the process of honing grantsgetting skills.

If your office is less busy during the summer than during the academic year, suggest to faculty that summer is an excellent time to work on proposals and offer your assistance. You will be able to devote more time to working with them and they may have fewer competing pressures.

Conducting Inservice Workshops

Workshops are an excellent vehicle for developing faculty grantsgetting skills. These workshops may range from a one-hour introductory session to a series of meetings, spaced so that each faculty member may actually work on drafting a proposal. Separate workshops may be offered for research and program development proposals. Alternatively, workshops may be targetted to various disciplines (e.g., natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, education).

Some of the topics which might be covered in workshops include the following:

- Planning the project to be funded
- Identifying the nature of funding sought—research, training, program support, demonstration

- Identifying sources of funding
- Contacting government agencies and foundations
- Establishing the need for your project
- Stating objectives or hypotheses
- Describing methodology
- Establishing your credibility to carry out the project successfully
- Describing program evaluation or hypothesis testing
- Preparing a budget
- Addressing future funding needs
- Packaging, submission, follow-up, and dealing with rejection.

As part of a workshop, your chief academic officer or a dean may be asked to present the views of the university concerning sponsored programs and ways in which the university supports research and program development. This kind of presentation can assure faculty that grant-seeking is a valued activity and suggest ways in which the university is willing to facilitate such an undertaking.

Outside consultants often have great credibility with faculty and may be especially helpful in the area of identifying grant sources. Consultants from the Federal Resources Advisory Service may be invited to give such a workshop. In some instances, officials of such agencies as the National Endowment for the Humanities, National Science Foundation, National Institute of Mental Health, or National Institute of Education may be willing to meet with your faculty. Speakers might discuss types of funding available from their agencies, procedures to be followed, and tips for success.

Workshops may also include panels composed of faculty members from your school or other nearby universities who have served as reviewers of grant applications for federal agencies or private foundations. Reviewers frequently mention how much they learn from such an experience, and this provides a way for them to share the knowledge they have gained with other faculty.

Providing Written Resources

Some faculty would like to explore grantsgetting in greater depth and may find resource books of value. You might have a small reference library available for circulation, and distribute an annotated list of these resources to let faculty know of this possibility. Examples of books appropriate for such a purpose are:

1. A *Basic Guide to Proposal Development* by Dr. John C. Morrow (Business Publishers, 818 Roeder Road, P.O. Box 1067, Silver Spring, MD 20910)
2. *A Process for Development of Ideas* by Jane C. Belcher, Ph.D. and Julia M. Jacobsen (Government Relations Office, 4416 Edmunds Street, NW, Washington, DC 20007)
3. *About Foundations: How to Find the Facts You Need to Get a Grant* by Judith B. Margolin (The Foundation Center, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10019)

4. *Developing Skills in Proposal Writing, Second Edition* by Mary Hall (Continuing Education Publications, 1633 SW Park, P.O. Box 1491, Portland, OR 97207)
5. *Federal Grants: A Basic Handbook* by Kathryn Mohrman with Myra Ficklen and Brenda Latimer (Federal Resources Advisory Service, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, NW Washington, DC 20009)
6. *Grants: How to Find Out About Them and What to Do Next* by Virginia P. White (New York: Plenum Press, 1975)
7. *How to Prepare a Research Proposal: Suggestions for Those Seeking Funds for Behavioral Science Research, Second Edition* by David R. Krathwohl (Syracuse University Bookstore, 303 University Place, Syracuse, NY 13210).

Most faculty will not want to spend the time to read detailed guides such as these. However, the majority will welcome a brief guide to which they can refer while drafting a proposal. To meet this need, you might develop two brief guides to proposal writing, one for research and the other for program development. Instead of writing your own guide for program development proposals, you may wish to obtain multiple copies of *Program Planning and Proposal Writing* (available from the Grantsmanship Center News, 1015 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 09915). A copy of the research proposal guide or program development guide can be given to a faculty member, together with a copy of the "Guidelines for Grant Submission" after an initial discussion of the proposal to be developed.

Summary

Grants may be viewed as funds which enable your school to undertake program development, research, and professional development. For the most part, it is the faculty who know the new programs which are desirable, the research they would like to carry out, and the professional development they need for their own growth and satisfaction as well as the school's wellbeing. Thus, your work with faculty may be critical to the success of your grants program.

One aspect of this work is communicating with faculty—learning of their interests and letting them know of grant opportunities. Some ways of communicating with faculty are attending departmental meetings, sending information via memo, publishing information in a newsletter, speaking at a faculty meeting, engaging faculty in identifying grant sources, and raising grants awareness by announcing all grants received. Faculty interest questionnaires, lists of grant opportunities by subject matter area, and written guidelines for grant submission can facilitate communication.

A second aspect of working with faculty is tutoring in grantsgetting skills through individual contacts, workshops, and reference materials. Faculty may need assistance in developing their ideas as well as in identifying funding sources and developing a proposal. Attitudes may be as important as technical skills in grants success. "Demystifying" the process by putting faculty into direct contact with program officers and with other faculty who have served as proposal reviewers may increase confidence.

If you are successful in working with faculty they will see you as an ally in accomplishing their goals and you will have the satisfaction of bringing ideas to reality.

MEMORANDUM

To: Full-Time Faculty, Area Heads

From: Dorothy A. Frayer
Executive Director of Grants, Contracts
and Research Administration

The Grants Office receives a great deal of information regarding funding in all subject matter areas. I would be happy to forward to you information relevant to your special interests. Funding is available in three areas:

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT - Released time for program development, instructional materials, equipment, consultants, travel, program evaluation, student support.

RESEARCH - Released time or summer support for research, equipment, supplies, travel, publication costs, research assistants.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - Sabbatical support, summer seminars, internships, travel abroad, post-doctoral fellowships.

If you would be interested in receiving information about funding opportunities, please complete the attached questionnaire and return it to the Grants Office, 207 Weller Hall.

In addition, I would welcome the opportunity to meet individually with you to discuss your needs and interests. The summer months are an especially good time for such meetings since there is adequate time to prepare a strong proposal before deadlines, many of which occur during the fall semester. Appointments may be set up by calling X-3515.

DAF:tc

Enc.

Appendix A (cont'd.)

Faculty Interest Profile

Name______________________________Department_______________

Grant support is available for program development, research, and professional development. Please provide a one-paragraph description of each project for which you would like support. Information relevant to funding sources for these projects will be sent as it becomes available.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT______________________________

RESEARCH______________________________________

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT_________________________

Please return this form to the Grants Office, 207 Weller Hall.

Using Grants For Faculty Development

GRANTS: VIEWS FROM THE CAMPUS

George A. Morgan

College and university administrators generally view grantgsgetting as a mechanism for helping them carry out the institutional purposes of research and community service and as a supplementary support for teaching innovations and graduate education. Grants are less often seen as a means of enhancing individual faculty development.

One of the key functions of the grants effort is to facilitate the professional growth of faculty members as part of a comprehensive faculty development program. This is especially important at two-and four-year colleges where relatively few faculty obtain grants and those who do are sometimes viewed as entrepreneurs operating outside the main purposes of the institution. The emphasis on individuals in this chapter is not intended to deny or play down the more direct institutional functions served by many grants. Rather, it is intended to provide balance by pointing out to faculty and administrators, who may not fully appreciate it, that institutional goals can also be served by encouraging the personal and professional development of faculty.

Faculty Development and the Role of Grants

Faculty members are the most important educational resources of a college; they are the principal sources for stimulating appropriate learning. Therefore, an ongoing program of faculty development and renewal should be a high priority at all educational institutions. Although most colleges would agree that it is important, the amount and types of support for faculty development have varied widely between institutions and over time.[1]

Traditionally, institutions focused their efforts on subject matter knowledge and professional competence by providing some support for research or study, travel funds, and sabbaticals. Many recent faculty development programs, especially at research universities, have shifted the emphasis from professional and subject matter competence to the improvement of teaching. One mechanism has been the establishment of teaching and learning centers which provide assistance to faculty who want to improve their courses or to try new teaching techniques. A number of undergraduate institutions have also promoted an instructional improvement ap-

---

George A. Morgan is Assistant Academic Vice President for Faculty Research and Development at the College of Charleston.

proach to faculty development in their attempts to deal with the problem of revitalizing the teaching of a fully-tenured, older faculty. This has seemed to be especially important as institutions face stable or declining enrollments and little opportunity to add "new blood."[2]

As a result of these trends, most current faculty development programs have focused on the improvement of courses and teaching techniques. However, in a broader sense, faculty development includes the personal and professional growth of individual faculty members. We feel that such a concern for professional growth should be especially important at undergraduate institutions where there may be a need to encourage faculty to look outside of their classrooms to broaden perspectives and professional experiences.

At the College of Charleston, which I would like to use as a case study and for concrete examples, we have developed a series of informal guidelines for faculty development.

1. The professional and scholarly development of faculty members is crucial for optimal student learning. Although there may well be competition for limited time, good teaching is clearly facilitated by active scholarship and research.

2. Each faculty member is a resource person, part of a campus-wide resource pool. We contend that it is not the particular offerings or arrangements of disciplines that produce liberal learning as much as it is exposure to faculty members who are not only competent and secure in their own fields, but also willing to converse and plan with like-minded colleagues from other fields. Thus, much of our program is directed toward encouraging this end.

3. Each faculty member is an example and a mentor to his students. Much of the research on student development during college indicates that changes in student attitudes and motivation result primarily from emulation of peers and/or selected faculty who serve as role models. Thus, several aspects of the program should attempt to assist faculty members to develop themselves as models, including broadening and expanding their experiences in the world outside the college.

4. In cooperation with the faculty, the academic administration should help to define the faculty development program by implementing policies and procedures to assist each faculty member in his or her professional and personal development. Leadership must also be provided in establishing meaningful reward systems to reinforce the development of teacher-scholars who will serve as resource persons and as mentors to students.

5. Faculty evaluation can be an important aspect of faculty development since it can reinforce personal growth and instructional improvement. A comparison of self-evaluations with colleague and student evaluations provides a good format for planned growth, but, because of the considerable anxiety about the formal evaluation process, it is necessary to provide resources for instructional and professional improvement. They should be, at least in part, divorced from the evaluation process.

6. Each aspect of the faculty development program should correlate with the stated aims of the academic program, better enabling faculty to reflect these goals in their teaching and personal interactions with students. They should have in common the improvement of teaching and student education through the growth of the faculty member as a person and a professional.[3]

60

Resources Needed

If the premise that nurturing the professional growth of individual faculty is accepted as important, provision should be made to have someone responsive to the need to assist individual faculty obtain grants. There are many possible staffing arrangements; the one we, at the College of Charleston, have found useful is to have a full-time assistant academic vice president responsible for faculty research and grants as well as a broad faculty development effort, which also includes instructional improvement.

It is important to note at the outset that placement of research and faculty development together in the academic dean's office has several benefits. It links faculty development, research, and grant-seeking with each other and with the ongoing teaching and curricular concerns of the college. Thus, the relative isolation of the individual research grant-seeker is reduced, and some of the prestige differences between types of grants—e.g., fellowships, research, instructional improvement, and workshops—can be diminished. All types of grants are viewed, at the College of Charleston, as appropriate means to a comprehensive end—faculty development—which is desired both by faculty members and the institution.

One of my main responsibilities has been to increase faculty awareness of opportunities for advanced study, research, and professional development. To help achieve this objective, I have discussed interests, needs, and possible sources of support, both local and external, with more than half of the faculty during the past year. In addition, printed information, concerning sources of outside funding for individual development, has been distributed to all faculty.

I feel that all colleges, even those with existing grants offices and those with faculty development programs which focus on instructional improvement, should have at least a part-time person to facilitate the faculty development aspect of the grants effort. This could be a faculty member with some experience in obtaining grants or fellowships. At a small institution, the dean could direct this effort personally, perhaps with the assistance of an intelligent, interested college graduate or masters-level person. With guidance and study such a person could become a valuable resource for the dean and the faculty.

The necessary information about workshops, fellowships, education programs, and small grants is plentiful and accessible. As a start, a faculty development grantsperson should become familiar with the free materials from the National Science Foundation (NSF) Science Education Directorate and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Fellowship and Education Divisions. Newsletters and books which summarize information about grants and fellowships to individuals, from private as well as federal sources, would also be helpful. We have found the Academic Research Information System (ARIS) Funding Messengers, published by Pacific Medical Center in San Francisco, to be very useful. These newsletters (Creative Arts and Humanities Report, Social and Natural Sciences Report, and Medical Sciences Report) provide deadlines, addresses and phone numbers of contact persons, and one paragraph descriptions of the grants or fellowships. Another good feature of the ARIS newsletters is that they are published a month in advance of the reported deadlines in that issue so that faculty have enough time to prepare proposals. Although last minute additions and contract requests are usually not included, full-time teachers rarely are prepared to drop everything and apply for them anyway.

More details about selected federally-funded programs, many of which have faculty development possibilities, are found in the FRAS *News Notes*. In addition to such newsletters, this development grantsperson should obtain and scan program announcements and application forms from federal agencies, societies, and foundations so that he/she will be able to advise faculty about appropriate funding sources.

Administrators at undergraduate institutions may be ambivalent about grants which do not seem to serve directly the educational or community service purposes of the institution. They may be concerned about the place and value of research in a teaching institution and/or uncertain that college funds to support this effort will be effective in helping faculty secure additional grants. I hope that this chapter will help alleviate those concerns.

Sources of Support for Faculty Development

Few faculty at undergraduate institutions, where teaching loads are heavy and space and facilities for research are not readily available, are in the mainstream of the research grants enterprise. Such faculty may, with some justification, view grants as unobtainable for them. Thus, another objective of the chapter is to list some possible sources of funds which can be obtained by faculty members like those just described. There may well be considerable faculty inertia to overcome and the odds on many individual grants and fellowships are, in fact, long. However, even writing proposals and trying for outside support can be a growth experience if coupled with financial and personal support. For example, college funds could be used to match outside grants with the faculty member receiving the match or some portion of it even if the application were not funded.

The types of sources we have found useful in facilitating faculty development will be discussed briefly under four headings: fellowships, small research grants, workshops, and education programs. Two useful books which give further information about the fellowship and individual grant opportunities, including those listed below, are: *Annual Register of Grant Support*, (Marquis Academic Media, Chicago) and *The Grants Register* (St. Martin's Press, New York). The ARIS newsletters mentioned above also provide such information.

Fellowships

Although there are many fellowships, most of the well known ones (e.g., Ford, Fulbright, Guggenheim, ACLS) are highly competitive so that only faculty who have been quite productive in their disciplines stand a reasonable chance. Since almost all of these fellowships require six months or more of full-time study or research, younger faculty, not yet due a sabbatical, often feel unable to leave their jobs and move their families. This is especially true if, as is often the case, the stipend is considerably less than their teaching salary. In spite of these obstacles, some faculty will find a good fit and likely have a valuable experience which will benefit both themselves and the institution. A handy free booklet which we have distributed to interested faculty is *A Selected List of Major Fellowship Opportunities and Aids to Advanced Education for United States Citizens* (Fellowship Office, National Research Council, Washington, DC).

Three fellowships should be named specifically because they are aimed at college teachers.

- NEH Category B Fellowships—independent study and research for undergraduate faculty
- NEH Category C Fellowships—seminars in residence with a distinguished scholar for college teachers
- NSF Science Faculty Professional Development Program.

Small Research Grants

Summer stipends and small grants for research expenses, such as supplies and travel, can be obtained by faculty for use during the summer while continuing to teach full-time during the academic year. Although funding for these grants is quite competitive, their small size eliminates some of the most prominent competition. Many institutions have similar internal faculty research mini-grants to provide faculty with support to get started and/or for small-scale projects.

The sources listed below can provide an important complement to an internal mini-grants program. For example, college funding can be used as matching funds to make the external funding more likely, thus, multiplying the effects of a relatively small amount of college money.

The following list includes, I think, almost all of the national sources of small research grants which cut across several disciplines.

- NEH Summer Stipends for research
- American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) Grants-in-Aid for Recent Recipients of the Ph.D. to prepare humanistic dissertations for publication
- ACLS Grants-in-Aid to less recent doctorates in the humanities
- American Philosophical Society grants for research expenses in a wide variety of disciplines
- Sigma Xi Grants-in-Aid of scientific research expenses
- NSF Support of Small College Faculty Research at Larger Institutions
- Research Corporation—Cottrell research grants for young investigators in the physical sciences
- National Institutes of Mental Health small research grants.

There are also a number of more limited focus small grants, often administered by professional societies, e.g., the Petroleum Research Fund grants administered by the American Chemical Society. Some associations, such as the American Historical Association, publish booklets of fellowships and grants available to professionals in that discipline.

Local or regional funds are also potentially very important sources which should be investigated carefully by the grantspersons because they are less likely to be known to faculty. For example, the Sloan Foundation gave a grant to the Southern Regional Education Board to help make available to science faculty at southern colleges research facilities which are not found on their campus. School systems, governments, and businesses may hire faculty for the summer or as consultants on special projects. Local foundations and organizations, such as a state arts commission, may provide small fellowships. These sources should be especially attractive to college faculty because they may provide less intensive competition for funds.

Funded Workshops and Seminars

Most of the many educational workshops, institutes, and conferences offered each year require faculty members or their institution to share the cost of the leaders as well as pay their own travel, room, and board. However, sometimes such programs are subsidized by a foundation or agency and are open to faculty by application. Most of these opportunities are unpredictable, but two that are specifically designed for undergraduate faculty and offered annually are (1) the two-month NEH Summer Seminars for college teachers and (2) the four-day NSF Chautauqua-type Short Courses.

In the last few years, the NEH Education Division has funded several institutes and a series of regional conferences. The latter have been designed to disseminate information about successful grants and to encourage teams of faculty from institutions without previous major NEH support to apply.

It is quite helpful for faculty to have someone who is alert to such possibilities and can assist them in their applications. Sometimes a small amount of supplementary travel support can make a substantial difference to faculty members, enabling them to take advantage of an opportunity which will benefit the institution as well as enhance their careers.

The College of Charleston itself has been able to offer several such subsidized faculty development workshops not only for our own faculty, but also for other faculty in South Carolina. We were able to do this with the aid of the Southern Regional Education Board Project on Undergraduate Renewal.

Education Programs

Many foundations and federal agencies fund innovative educational programs which benefit not only the institution and students, but also the faculty participants. In order to get funding, the faculty members must think creatively about new courses or significant changes in current ones. They gain experience and skill in presenting ideas and, if provided support, they can learn about the administration of a program.

The two most obvious sources of curriculum development support for undergraduate colleges are the NEH Education Division and the NSF Science Education Directorate. For example, NEH Pilot Grants enable institutions with tentative, but concrete, plans to test and evaluate new humanities courses, and their Development Grants fund the initiation of programs. The NSF Local Course Improvement (LOCI) and Comprehensive Assistance to Undergraduate Science Education (CAUSE) grants are similar programs for science and social science curricular changes. On these grants, faculty are usually provided with released time and/or a summer salary to finalize plans for the program, often in conjunction with colleagues. This sort of activity is, we feel, at the heart of meaningful faculty development and should be encouraged with appropriate technical support and cost-sharing commitments.

Case Study—The College of Charleston

The College of Charleston is a middle-sized, four-year, state-controlled institution. Until three years ago, there was little emphasis on faculty development and the grants focus was almost exclusively on institutional, especially public service, programs. Few faculty were involved in planning, writing, or conducting sponsored programs, even institutional grants. Last year about a dozen faculty obtained fellowships or small research grants of the types mentioned above, and another 20 or so were able to participate in funded workshops. With less than $15,000 in college financial support, we were able to provide matching or supplementary support, where necessary, for these faculty and also to encourage more than a dozen others with internal mini-grant support.

The increase in the number of externally-funded individual grants and workshops followed and was clearly facilitated by the college-supported mini-grant program for faculty research and development, which began three years ago. Almost all successful external grantees had previously held a college mini-grant and, in several cases, contemporaneous college funding served as a necessary match. Of course, the main factor in obtaining a grant is the quality of the faculty member's ideas and the adequacy of his or her qualifications. However, the confidence, experience, and data gained from obtaining and carrying out a college grant, plus the information, support, and technical assistance we were able to provide applicants for outside support were also quite important factors in the success of these faculty, some of whom would not even have applied otherwise.

More importantly, for the main thesis of this paper, we feel that obtaining support for individual research and workshop participation has encouraged both the recipients and their colleagues to think about broader educational goals and to become involved in programs to achieve them. Almost all of the faculty who have obtained external individual grants and most of the considerably larger number who have had internal research support have also been involved with special programs intended to improve student learning opportunities. It is not possible to prove that the support a faculty member received for research and professional growth caused additional involvement in educational programs, but, at the very least, the two seemed to be quite compatible and mutually supportive. We have definitely not found a dichotomy between faculty who obtain research support and those involved in imaginative teaching.

I would like now to present a few brief, slightly modified, and disguised examples from our recent experience to illustrate the ways in which encouraging faculty to apply for individual grants can enhance the institutional educational climate and the concept of faculty as a dynamic resource pool.

A group of science faculty, most of whom had recently obtained research support from the Environmental Protection Agency or the college, has obtained summer undergraduate research participation support from Sea Grant and applied to NSF for further funding. Several faculty, who have had college and/or outside support from fellowships or small research grants like those listed earlier, are involved in planning an honors program and revisions in the general education humanities program, with the support of an NEH-funded consultant. Faculty members who were at first unsuccessful in obtaining a CAUSE grant perservered partly due to administrative encouragement, and received Title VI-A equipment and NSF Local Course Improvement grants. Several social scientists have used their research skills, honed with college minigrants, to help expand and strengthen the curriculum and applied research components of our metropolitan affairs center. A scientist who spent the summer as an NSF-supported small college faculty member doing research at a university with a regular NSF grantee helped the college obtain an NSF instructional scientific equipment grant. Humanities faculty members, who have had college research minigrants are planning summer courses abroad for students. Finally, a summary of the projections from the annual report of another science department exemplifies the dynamics of the resource pool concept mentioned earlier.

Research begun with a grant for observation time at the Kit Peak National Observatory and a college mini-grant will be completed this year. The NSF LOCI grant, which involved all members of the department, will produce 20 instructional video tapes and improved lab exercises. One faculty member, who attended a DOE-funded energy education workshop is helping develop a grant proposal, through the Center for Metropolitan Affairs and Public Policy, which includes a City-College energy conservation program. When funded, this proposal will also provide undergraduate research opportunities. Another faculty member will conduct seminars on teaching for the department and other interested colleagues to pass on what he learned from his contacts with a nationally-known teacher during his three-week college mini-grant. Tentative plans are being made to turn a room in the science building into a learning center. The room will include individual study areas, a mini-computer terminal, space for long-term lab projects, and a testing area for a self-paced course. A soon-to-be purchased portable dome will be used, with a planetarium projector donated to the college, to present programs for local school groups as well as college classes. In addition, we will continue to be active participants in on-campus faculty development activities and off-campus professional conferences and workshops. We feel that these activities will lead to improvement in the overall scholarship and learning climate at the

College of Charleston.

These examples indicate not merely that active people are active in several areas, but that a cross fertilization has occured between research, teaching, and community service. Furthermore, we feel that we are only beginning to see the effects of our efforts to assist faculty in their professional development. In the next few years, we anticipate seeing many more examples of individual professional development leading, directly or indirectly, to educational and service programs. Not only do grants beget grants, but planning new ideas in one area seems to generate ideas in others. It is important to emphasize that this spreading effect will take place only in a climate where there is genuine and balanced administrative support (including salary, promotion, and tenure rewards) for all of these several aspects of a comprehensive faculty development program.

Conclusions

The preceding discussion has shown that a variety of grants for individual faculty are obtainable and that getting them often leads to substantial faculty growth. Without administrative support, faculty efforts are much less likely to achieve the ends we have described above. Finally, faculty success and growth pay dividends to the institution and its educational program which we feel are well worth the effort and expense.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the useful comments made by Wendell Johnson of Hiram College, Felix Goodson of DePauw University, Tom Morgan of the University of Chicago, and J.M. Bevan, Paul Hamill, John O'Hara, Jack Dressler, and George Haborak of the College of Charleston.

FOOTNOTES:

[1] Jerry Gaff's, *Toward Faculty Renewal* (Jossey-Bass, 1975) is a thorough presentation of the many aspects of faculty development and how they are practiced at U.S. colleges and universities.

[2] See the *Change* magazine booklet *Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment*, (1974).

[3] Many of these ideas are drawn from papers and presentations by J.M. Bevan, Academic Vice President at the College of Charleston. See for example "Faculty Resource Pool" in *North Carolina Libraries*, Vol. 35, 1978, 33-41 and "Faculty Development" presented at Estes Park Deans Workshop, June 1974, cited in Gaff *Toward Faculty Renewal*, pp. 106-7.

Special Concerns of Two-Year Colleges

GRANTS:
VIEWS
FROM
THE
CAMPUS

John C. Rude

From the outside, community and junior colleges appear to be the ideal types of institutions to attract grants. They usually have large, stable enrollments and enjoy solid financial support from state or local tax bases. More importantly, they have positive "images" to work with: most community colleges receive substantial support from local citizens, and are viewed by opinion leaders and politicians as part of the "new era" of postsecondary education.

The view from the inside is not quite as glowing, but community colleges do indeed have potential (largely unexploited) for securing federal and foundation funds. The National Council for Resource Development (an affiliate of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges) conducts an annual review of the community college "track record" with federal agencies. The FY 1977 report, written by Jeffrey A. Stuckman of Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, contains the following "dismal" facts:

- In HEW's six newest programs (Career Education, Community Education, Environmental Education, Ethnic Heritage, Metric Education, and Women's Educational Equity), community colleges received 1.9 percent of the awards and 1.7 percent of the dollars in FY 1977—even though 30 percent of all postsecondary students were enrolled in community colleges that year.
- Over half of the proposals submitted to the National Institute of Mental Health by four-year institutions were funded; less than one-fourth of the community college proposals submitted to the same agency received funds.
- Only 1.1 percent of the Local Public Works Capital Development grants were awarded to community colleges, despite the fact that this was the largest funding opportunity in recent years for capital improvements in all types of public institutions.
- Community colleges were shut out of the Handicapped Research program of the U.S. Office of Education; none of the 27 proposals was funded, while one of every five (21.2 percent) of four-year institutions were funded.
- At least seven federal programs suited for two-year schools gave no grants to community colleges because no proposals were submitted.

John C. Rude is Coordinator of Project Development at Chemeketa Community College.

Why do community colleges experience such difficulty in competing with four-year institutions? The evidence collected by Dr. Stuckman and Dr. John E. Young of Santa Fe Community College in Gainesville, suggests that there are a number of common problems:

- Community colleges rely too heavily on "formula" grant programs (e.g., Nursing Capitation, Title II-A Library, Title VI Equipment) and do not apply for grants in competitive programs.
- Proposals submitted by community colleges are not considered to be of high "professional" caliber; bad proposals, in turn, reflect badly on all community colleges.
- Community colleges are not adequately represented on reading panels that review and rank submitted applications.
- Community college presidents and other resource personnel are not well-informed about the availability and sources of federal funds.
- The administrative philosophy governing some colleges does not support "risk-taking" or active development efforts.
- Community colleges don't know how to start, support, or operate a resource development (or federal relations) program.
- Negative associations with federal programs (for example, audits, unreasonable reporting requirements, excessive dependency on grants, government interference) discourage community colleges from becoming involved in development and foster insecurity when colleges try to compete with more "sophisticated" postsecondary institutions.

These generalizations do not apply in every case, but those community colleges that would like to improve their grants-winning performance should focus on *internal organization.* A well-organized approach is fundamental to any successful development effort, but it is especially important for colleges that are trying to preserve their local accountability and "open-door" philosophy.

Internal Organization

The following suggestions apply the principles discussed elsewhere in this handbook to the unique setting of the community college.

Emphasizing Faculty Involvement and Incentive. Unlike four-year and graduate faculty, community college instructors receive little encouragement to conduct special research or demonstration projects. Their roles are defined by the teaching mission, which is central to the identity of community colleges. Grants are relegated to the management staff, who are already overworked, and seldom are rewarded for risk-taking behavior.

The quantity and quality of applications will improve dramatically if community college faculty are given incentives to submit grants. Development officers can lay the groundwork for an incentive system through regular contact with faculty by means of such simple techniques as interviews, surveys, newsletters, faculty-development seminars, and attendance at departmental meetings. When the faculty develops confidence in the college grants office, more elaborate incentive systems can be attempted.

Techniques currently in use include: (1) granting release time and overtime pay for faculty involvement in grant-writing; (2) including grant-writing efforts as "credits" in employee performance evaluations; (3) administering a system of "mini-grants" to reward faculty innovation; and (4) granting direct salary supplements to successful applicants by including these costs in the negotiated indirect-cost formula. Incentive systems frequently pose special financial, legal, or political problems, but it should be possible for community colleges to discover ways of rewarding faculty that are comparable (if not equal) to the incentives provided in four-year institutions.

Establishing Clear Priorities for Grant-Seeking Activity

Community colleges are typically very complex in their organizational structure and mission. They serve a broad collection of constituents, and decision-making is frequently decentralized in order to give various support groups access to the political machinery of the institution. As a result, the decision-making environment is often cumbersome and does not permit the incisive choices and rapid responses that are fundamental to any successful development effort.

Every college, no matter how well-staffed, is going to have a limited amount of time to respond to the multitude of funding possibilities. The governmental affairs/development office plays a critical role in separating the wheat from the chaff, but ultimately, the top-level administrators will have to establish priorities for grant submission. In order to do this, they will need accurate, concise information about federal programs at the earliest possible date before the submission deadline.

The development office should confer with the college deans and/or president on a monthly basis, and review all deadline possibilities during the subsequent 60 days. When a decision to apply is made, or a grant opportunity occurs between monthly meetings, a "grant alert" may be sent to all affected parties. (When informing college staff of grant opportunities, it is important to remember that the business, personnel, and affirmative action staff need early information and may be helpful in establishing priorities.) One college administrator—usually the president, but never the development officer—should be given "go/no go" authority on all decisions to apply for grants. The governing board of the institution should also be informed on a monthly basis of grant submissions. Institutional priorities are often affected by governing board decisions. Regular review of submissions (*after* the application has been submitted, but *before* a grant award is accepted) are, therefore, extremely useful in determining the direction of a college's development program.

Integrating the Development Program With the College's Long-Range Goals and Objectives

Too frequently, community colleges are involved in "crisis management" and are not equipped to make long-range forecasts of resource development needs. Most colleges are able to make reasonably accurate forecasts of enrollment patterns, but they seldom link these forecasts to their overall development strategies. A decline in enrollment, for example, might lead to a revenue loss which—if predicted accurately and with one or two years' lead time—could be ameliorated with special external funding efforts. Long-range planning may also help community colleges overcome the negative effects of the current "taxpayer's revolt;" excessive dependency on grants could cause the administration or board to limit the number of grants submitted, in order to head off any criticism related to excessive federal red tape.

To avoid crisis management and "dollar chasing," the development office must take a long-range view of its overall impact on the institution. Development staff should submit an annual report to the governing board which provides detailed information on the impact of grants on enrollment, matching funds, overhead costs, affirmative action compliance, local and federal interagency relationships, "soft money" dependency, union-management relationships, etc. The development office should be able to report not only the impact of grants during the past year, but project trends over the next five years. Analysis of rejected applications can also be very useful for developing a long-range view of the college's performance in grant submissions. If there are consistent patterns of rejection by particular agencies or foundations, or patterns of missed deadlines, or abandoning proposals in mid-writing, it is likely that the college is misallocating its resources and should explore new (possibly more modest) development strategies.

Focusing on Development Rather Than Grant-Seeking

The most common mistake of even experienced development officers is to become too deeply involved in the production of proposals. There is a host of non-productive activities which can divert the development staff away from its essential purpose—that of *coordinating* the institution's development strategy. It is the responsibility of the college's management and instructional staff, rather than the development office, to establish funding targets. Ideally, these line staff members will be working in teams, independent from the grants office. Development teams, clustered around specific program areas (such as services to disadvantaged students, manpower programs, instructional innovation, etc.) should assume responsibility (and take the credit) for meeting development goals. The role of the development office should center on the development of positive relationships with funding agencies, evaluation of ideas, matching grant concepts with potential funding sources, evaluating long-range effects of projects, determining cost effectiveness, avoiding duplication of projects, and identifying "hidden" costs of grants to the institution. An effective development office is accountable to the institution as a whole, rather than any specific applicant or funding agency. It is essential, therefore, for this office to stress efficiency and neutral coordination of projects, rather than take credit (or blame) for the outcome of specific applications.

Developing Informational and Support Networks in the Local Community

It is ironic that community colleges often neglect the political resources at their own doorsteps when establishing development programs. This hesitancy is often caused by concern about increasing the complexity of federal involvement, or igniting a community backlash against red tape and bureaucracy. While these concerns may in some cases be well-founded, there are often local networks of social service and educational agencies that will willingly assist community colleges in their grant-seeking efforts. These agencies (for example, CETA prime sponsors, school districts, mental health agencies, councils on alcoholism, community action agencies) may have access to research tools, publications, and libraries that can be useful in the college's development program. Frequently, the grantspersons from these agencies meet periodically to discuss upcoming deadlines or policy changes in federal programs. If such a group has not been formed, it is possible that your institution would be viewed as an appropriate sponsor. Another way of broadening community support—and gaining access to new information and new funding possibilities—is to establish consortia with local agencies and colleges when submitting individual proposals. Occasionally, regional or state-wide consortia of community colleges will discover that they have more to gain by submitting joint applications than by entering into competition with each other. A consistent exploration of the possibilities for resource sharing, with libraries, theater and arts organizations, correctional institutions, women's organizations, etc., can lead the college into exciting new areas that will improve the institution's capacity to attract grants.

Conclusion

Community colleges need not be intimidated by the complexity of procedures for applying for federal or foundation funds. In most instances, they can compete successfully with other postsecondary institutions and non-profit organizations. *The key to success is a well-organized approach.* The problem of low faculty incentive can be overcome with the involvement of the highest level policymakers at the college. The tendency to establish an opportunistic development strategy, based on deadlines and dollar-chasing, should be resisted. A committed and imaginative faculty is one of the community college's inherent strengths; broad faculty involvement is therefore needed for long-range success. Community colleges need to develop a long-range view of grants and contracts, and match these long-range efforts with the institution's overall planning and development. If grant applications are not placed within such a context, the development office may be "successful" in the short run, but may soon place intolerable strains on the college's capacity to absorb external funds.

Special Concerns of Four-Year Colleges

GRANTS:
VIEWS
FROM
THE
CAMPUS

Bruce A. Mack

Traditionally, institutions of higher education have been faced with a variety of factors and trends affecting the delivery of their academic programs and educational services. Because of decreases in the number of students graduating from high school and increases in basic operating costs, administrators and faculty members, particularly those at four-year colleges, have been exploring and pursuing methods of securing additional funds from various external sources to maintain and enhance their programs. One method used by many of these institutions is the grants process. Although the grants effort varies slightly from college to college, the grants process can assist many institutions of higher learning in pursuing specific educational activities, thus enabling them to take positive steps towards fulfilling their educational mission.

Although the actual grants process is the same for all institutions of higher education, certain aspects of the process exist which will affect the grants effort of four-year colleges. Typically, these institutions have been private, church-related, or independent colleges offering a variety of baccalaureate programs and serving a student body of approximately 500 to 3,200 students. Therefore, special needs exist at four-year colleges which the personnel should consider when institutionalizing a grants program.

Understanding the Grants Effort

To many people at the four-year college, the term "grantsgetting" means different things. Administrators see grantsgetting as a way of obtaining additional funding to develop activities and programs which heretofore could not be developed due to limitations of the college's annual operating budget. On the other hand, members of the faculty view the grants process differently, as an annoying task consuming their class preparation and research time and usually not being defined as part of their contractual obligation with the institution.

Grantsgetting is a process which involves identifying specific institutional needs, researching potential funding agents, and matching the institutional needs with the appropriate funding agent(s).

Bruce A. Mack was formerly the Assistant to the Director of Development at King's College (Pennsylvania) and is now a doctoral student at the University of Michigan.

Implementing the Grants Effort

When four-year colleges attempt to obtain external funding, institutional commitment is an important component of the total process. Institutional commitment indicates to the funding agent that the college wants the results of the proposed project to be incorporated as part of the institution's total educational program.

Four-year colleges can demonstrate institutional commitment in three ways. First, the institution can demonstrate dollar commitment by identifying costs to be incurred during the grant period which the college will assume with funds from the institution's annual operating budget. For example, during the grant it may be necessary for the academic dean to meet with members of the project staff. These meetings may consume 10 percent of the dean's time. This means 10 percent of his/her salary may be shown as a match.

Secondly, the college can demonstrate organizational commitment by describing and documenting what steps have been or will be taken to institutionalize the results of the project. For example, if the project's objective is to develop a new academic major, the college would describe the steps taken to obtain administrative and faculty approval. Also, if the college has a written statement describing this process, it could be appended and referred to in the narrative.

Third, the institution can cite alternatives to be followed if the grant is not funded. A four-year college could describe how specific phases of the project would be developed over an extended period of time with limited funds being provided annually from the institution's operating budget. This demonstrates that the college is willing to allocate specific portions of its annual budget towards the project, but that the college is committed to making the project part of its regular programs and services.

Since more and more four-year colleges are pursuing various grant opportunities, it is easy for these institutions to become victims of the classic grantsgetting mistake. Individuals at four-year colleges may know or read about other institutions receiving grants for curriculum revisions, development of new courses, or faculty development programs. This knowledge can prompt individuals at these institutions to approach the same funding sources with similar proposals. The result may be grants for which these institutions have no need at this particular time.

The classic grantsgetting mistake can be detrimental to four-year colleges for two reasons. First, all grants require an investment in terms of staff time. This means specific members of the administration and faculty must be actively involved with the project, preventing them from spending time on their regular duties which are often more important to the institution. Secondly, institutional funds must be spent on a project. Expenses such as conferences, travel, and consultation time arise during the course of the grant which were not expected when the grant application was being prepared and consequently must be assumed by the institution.

This is why four-year colleges should pursue grant opportunities providing the greatest return to the institution. Colleges can do this by ranking institutional needs on a priority basis. For example, during the summer, the grants officer should meet with the chairperson of each

74

academic department and the head of each administrative unit. These meetings would allow the grants officer to ask these people about the major financial needs within their departments and units. The grants officer would then group these needs functionally under the headings of Academic Affairs, Business Affairs, Development/Public Relations, and Student Affairs. Next, the grants officer would present this list of financial needs to each chairperson and administrative head so they could rank the financial needs under each category. Once this information was compiled, the grants officer or his/her superior would present this information to members of the college's senior administrative staff to determine which institutional needs should receive top priority for the coming academic year.

This approach to determining priorities should prevent the college from chasing dollars which may not help the institution fulfill its educational mission. Once the institution has determined its priorities for funding, the grants officer should be able to do a better job of identifying potential funding agents. Also, this process should help create a more positive attitude by the faculty towards the grants process, since they will know the college is committed to developing and submitting proposals which can help them enhance the quality of their educational programs.

Once the college has made its commitment to the grants process and determined its priorities for funding, it will be necessary to develop an institutional awareness of the college's grants effort. The grants officer must continually inform the college community about grant opportunities. Personal contact is the best method, but a grants newsletter, circulated every other week to members of the college community, can facilitate this effort.

The grants newsletter would be divided into three sections. Section 1 would be labeled *Grant Funds Available* and would list the names of at least funding agencies (foundation and government). A brief description of projects supported in the past would be included as well as upcoming deadlines and the range of grant awards. This information can be obtained from the *Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance* and *The Foundation Directory*.

Section 2 of the newsletter would be labeled *Grants Submitted and Pending*. This section would list the name(s) of the project staff, the title of the proposal, the funding agency receiving the proposal, and the total dollar amount requested.

Section 3 of the newsletter would be labeled *Grants Received*. Once the institution had received official notification of an award, the grants officer would cite the information noted in section two. This will enable members of the project staff to be recognized for their time and efforts, which should encourage other members of the administration and faculty to become more actively involved in the college's grants effort. Also, it should help dispel philosophical and practical notions ("only the large well-known schools receive grants," "I'm too busy teaching," etc.) many of these people have about grantsgetting.

Evaluating the Grants Effort

Once an institution has made the decision to actively seek external funding and has designed a grants strategy, the college should develop a method of quantitatively and qualitatively evaluating its grants effort. One way of quantitatively evaluating the grants effort would be to establish a dollar goal. The dollar goal will not only provide an exact measure of the college's and the grants officer's performance, but will monitor the effectiveness of the grants effort throughout the academic year. Although institutions expect to attain their goals, it is important to remember that a dollar goal is a projection dependent upon the level of administrative and faculty support as well as the degree of institutional commitment to the grants effort.

An institution can determine a dollar goal in several ways. The grants office can contact several colleges of similar size (in terms of enrollment and fundraising capability) to find out what proportion of their total revenue is produced by grant funds. Also, an institution can analyze what proportion of grant revenue the college has generated over the past few years and forecast what the institution may expect to raise during the upcoming academic year. Finally, the institution can use a professional consultant to develop its grants effort and to establish a realistic dollar goal.

There are other quantitative factors which a four-year college may want to consider as part of its evaluation. The institution can keep a record of the number of proposals submitted within a given time period (monthly, quarterly, etc.) and the actual number of proposals funded within this time period. The relationship between these two factors will enable the college to determine if too much time or too little time is being spent on specific foundation and government efforts without realizing a dollar return on their efforts.

Although quantitative measures are important, they should not be the sole factor utilized to evaluate the college's grants effort. Qualitative factors should also be part of the process. An important qualitative factor to consider is the professional relationship the grants officer has with members of the administration and the faculty. This relationship will affect the grants officer's ability to prepare grant applications and to see a project through to fruition.

Another qualitative factor to consider would be the extent to which the grants officer seeks new sources of funding and effectively disseminates this information before grant deadlines. Although the expression "time is money" may seem trite, time is a crucial element in the grants process, a factor of which the grants officer must be conscious when pursuing various grant opportunities.

A third qualitative factor to consider would be the service orientation of the grants officer. As mentioned in the first chapter, he or she must help different people within the college without always receiving credit for the time and effort expended. It means the grants officer should be a flexible individual who does not mind dealing with a variety of ideas and issues. This is most important as the grants officer must rely upon different individuals within the college for assistance in preparing each grant application.

The institution's strategy for evaluating its grants effort should be a combination of quantitative and qualitative factors to determine if the college is moving toward its goals.

Summary

The grants effort is a good way for any four-year college to obtain additional funds to maintain and enhance their educational programs. If an institution is to be successful in its efforts, special needs exist which the personnel at these institutions should consider when developing a grants effort. Institutional commitment is an important component of the process because it indicates to the funding agent that the college wants to incorporate the results of the proposed project as part of the institution's total educational effort. Four-year colleges should also determine their priorities for grant funds so that they do not waste time chasing grants which will not provide the institution with a return on its investment. This means the college should develop an institutional awareness of the grants effort so that members of the college will understand where the college is heading. Also, the college should conduct a formal evaluation of the quantitative and qualitative factors which will affect the success of the institution's grants efforts. Since the educational mission and size of most four-year colleges does vary, by incorporating these elements of the grants process into their grants effort these institutions should be able to address the special needs of the four-year college.

Special Concerns of Comprehensive Colleges and Universities

GRANTS:
VIEWS
FROM
THE
CAMPUS

Lewis N. Pino

A comprehensive college or university is one which offers many separate undergraduate and graduate degree programs, each attracting its own students and each under the control of a semiautonomous faculty. A medium-sized institution of this sort might consist of a college of arts and sciences, surrounded by schools or colleges of education, economics and management, nursing, engineering, pharmacy, architecture, etc., under the general supervision of an academic vice president. A university may be said to have reached major status when it acquires a medical school whose faculty doesn't admit to control by anyone.

In situations of this sort, the grants officer faces a complex internal structure as well as a wide spectrum of external granting agencies. The key concern is "how does a grants officer deal with a gaggle of octopi?" Our experience suggests that the external problem can be eased by inviting significant others from the campus to travel with you to visit potential funding sources. Each trip is set up to respond to the needs of a particular academic unit with, say, a two-day psychologists's tour of Washington designed to include stops at appropriate program units (e.g., NSF, NIMH, AOA, NIE, HUD, and USOE). Visits of this sort can be considered successful if the individuals you have introduced to the Washington scene begin to be recognized as secondary sources of information, advice, and encouragement.

The network approach works well because it, quite properly, distributes the responsibility for keeping up with major developments in the larger world. I suspect, however, that this strategy must be buttressed, from time to time, by additional full-time professional staff members in the grants office as the total grant and contract volume grows. In 1977-78, Oakland University received $3.82 million in external project support, and the strain on our one-professional, two- secretary office is beginning to show, particularly because we have other responsibilities not necessarily related to grants and contracts. If we were to add one professional staff member and one secretary, we could improve our service substantially while adding only marginally to our audited indirect cost rate. That sort of addition could hold us until our external support level reaches $6.0 million per year.

Lewis N. Pino is Professor of Chemistry and Director of Research and Instructional Services at Oakland University.

Staffing a Research Fund

Whatever the pattern of formal and informal staffing, one absolute necessity is a university research fund, under the control of the grants office, which can assist the research efforts of individual members of the faculty; we place particular emphasis on the needs of those starting up significant new lines of research. We use a competitive approach to an internal research fund which currently is at an annual level of $70,000. We also have an NIH-supported Biomedical Sciences Research Support Grant fund (current level $42,000) which is accessible in much the same fashion as the university research fund.

The university senate has a standing 10-member committee on research which acts as a peer review council to establish priorities in funding. In a non-trivial way, this review process acts not only to identify and support active, well-qualified researchers but also to sensitize the general faculty to the virtues of clear, clean, cogent proposals. For the past several years we have funded about 50 percent of proposals submitted to us; we are seen as tough but fair, which means that poorly presented requests are denied. Obviously, I show great interest in the winners, since many of them will go on to obtain external support.

Service on the university research committee is a distinct honor. When the faculty are polled each fall to determine preferences for university service, the research committee draws twice as many first and second preferences as any other university committee assignment, in spite of the fact that it is one of the hardest working groups on campus.

A number of the larger universities have extended the concept of a university research fund by establishing an educational development fund offering support for course and curricular development. Oakland has begun the process in a modest way by funding departmental study proposals on the assumption that a department or a department-like unit can learn a great deal from careful inspection of the effects of course and curricular improvement efforts on other campuses. Thus, a typical proposal might ask for support on the order of $1,000 so that two or three members of the department in question could carry out a series of visits to comparable departments at other institutions. This sort of inventory of the strengths of the "enemy" has served us well. We can, for example, trace a significant CAUSE grant ($222,400) to a Local Course Improvement grant from NSF plus a series of visits to other institutions carried out during the summer of 1977 by a two-man team from the chemistry department.

It's interesting to note that faculty pressure to increase the size of the university research fund has been a great deal more intense than the pressure to increase the educational development fund. One would hope that, in time, these two funds would be at roughly the same level. At the moment, our educational development fund is about a tenth the size of the university research fund.

One should also not overlook the influence and importance of a well-regulated program of regular sabbatical leaves for full-time members of the faculty and staff. In particular, when internal grant support is coordinated with time provided by sabbatical leaves, one can expect the emergence of some really fine proposals for external support of both research and curricular improvement.

Grants Administration

Let's turn now from pre-proposal activity to matters of grants administration. My starting point is agreement with Raymond J. Woodrow of Princeton that responsibility for grants administration should be fixed in the grants office. Only in this way can programmatic commitments made prior to issuance of a grant be given the same attention as fiscal agreements. The business office should be responsible for recording and reporting fiscal transactions, with the grants office handling all other matters—especially rebudgeting and approval for those programmatic variations which are inevitable in the course of a project. One cannot stress too strongly the good experiences of the large research universities with this unification of responsibility and authority. The reader is directed to Woodrow's thoughtful booklet[1] for greater detail on this point and a good many others.

Local Practice

A major concern, in more complex institutions, is the need for careful definition of "local practice." Specifically, I have in mind the expectation on the part of most funding agencies that, in the absence of contrary agreements, grant and contract funds will be used in accord with local practice. However, when working with half a dozen or more quite different faculty units, one finds rather quickly that "local practice" differs from one school to the next.

These varying practices can and must be reconciled if one is to have a set of uniform and equitable policies on matters such as internal and external consulting, appointment and purchasing procedures, travel reimbursement, and so on. If they are not reconciled, you can be certain that a federal auditor will note the problems in a disallowance report. These reports can provide an expensive education for the unwary.

The grants officer is in a unique position to detect gaps and flaws in internal management procedures. For example, the initiation of a grant-supporting training effort in Department X may reveal quite clearly the lack of mechanisms for appointing postdoctorals in training to appropriate positions within the university family. These positions, normally filled by individuals who will stay no more than two or three years, have to be defined carefully if they are to conform both to agency requirements and to uniform local practice. For example, a post-doc on a research grant may not be treated the same as a post-doc on an individual fellowship. Older institutions with an extended record of involvement with grants and contracts made arrangements for post-docs many years ago; but newer institutions may well find that a lot of attention has to be given to developing proper personnel policies in order to define local practice for post-doctorals and for others.

Those responsible for employment relations within a complex institution eventually

80

recognize the need to seek the advice and counsel of the grants officer before initiating significant changes in local personnel practices. It may be particularly useful to involve a grants officer if the faculty is considering unionization since a whole new set of personnel relationships are likely to be negotiated and codified in the first or second faculty agreement.

Controlling Grant Funds

An additional concern, clearly not limited to comprehensive colleges and universities, is the campus attitude toward what are called "soft monies." There is a sense on the part of many that grant dollars somehow are not green. Thus, some departments tend to exercise less control on grant dollars than on "real money." It is not uncommon to find pressure to apply different sets of criteria to the use of grant funds, with some grantees expecting that reimbursement for, say, travel expenses will be more generous from grant funds than from general fund accounts. Local practice must be defended perpetually.

Obviously, a grants office should contribute to the orderly and rational development of an institution. If, for example, a group of faculty is tempted by a five-year contract to train tank-drivers for the U.S. Army, you had better make darn sure that the faculty and the administration are prepared to accept this initiative before you endorse and mail a response to the RFP. In other words, there are useful federal dollars and there are others which may not be so healthy for your institution. A grants office, therefore, must be judged on the quality and usefulness of the grants brought in as well as the volume. Training grants, especially, have to be examined with a great deal of care, lest the secondary and tertiary effects of this sort of money produce more harm than good.

Let me illustrate with a current problem. A good many universities have, with the aid of federal research grants, discovered a useful symbiosis between research and graduate study. Some senior faculty have become so accustomed to directing the efforts of squads of graduate students that they are unable to uncouple their own research programs from continuing support for graduate research assistants. The use of graduate students in major research teams is addictive, so that the obvious need to curtail the production of Ph.D.s in certain areas can be ignored easily. The substitution of undergraduates or technicians for graduate students may well be in the national interest but persuading department X or college Y to take steps of this kind may not be easy. The graduate dean and his advisory council may have to intervene in this instance, if they can, since overproduction of doctorates will, in the long run, serve neither national nor local interests.

To repeat, it is my view that the grants officer, whether in a large or small institution, does have a major role in planning for academic development. Far too many institutions fail to recognize that aspect of the position. The grants office must be a center for early detection of faculty capabilities and concerns as well as a monitor of changing currents on the national scene. An institution will be well served if a good grants officer is invited, on a regular basis, into those continuing discussions which attempt to define needed improvements in institutional capabilities, if only because the search for venture capital is much easier if proposals can be based on solid plans for future development.

Obviously the duties of the grants officer in various kinds and sizes of institutions show more similarities than differences. We all deal with the same sorts of problems. It may be that the larger and more complex the institution, the more challenging the assignment becomes. In any event, all of us are perennial optimists or we would not be grantswingers.

FOOTNOTE:

[1] R.J. Woodrow, *Management for Research*, 1978; NACUBO, Washington, DC.

The Role of the President in the Grants Effort

GRANTS: VIEWS FROM THE CAMPUS

James F. Gollattscheck
Gary D. Hollingsworth

In most colleges, the person who exerts the greatest influence on institutional policy is the college president. His knowledge of and support for the grant activities of the college are crucial to the success of these endeavors. Since he is the individual who most directly affects the establishment of institutional priorities, he is also the one who can best direct the coordination of internal resources and, at the same time, guarantee to external funding agencies that these resources will be fully utilized and coordinated for successful implementation of funded projects.

The Grants Process

The grants process is a complex one requiring a number of individuals working together on an institutional basis. Although some colleges have successful grant programs without presidential involvement, they usually do so because some other top administrator facilitates the process. It is our belief, however, that for the efforts of an institution to be most successful, the president must influence the process directly—giving it guidance, providing it with requisite resources, and generally encouraging and supporting it.

A major goal of the college president should be to make the objectives of the grants office consistent with institutional objectives. If this goal is reached, it will contribute to the successful operation of both the grants office and the college. A mistake made by some institutions is to use the "shotgun" approach in applying for grants—going after every grant available regardless of the college's need, genuine interest in the program, or intent to support. While such efforts will undoubtedly produce dollars and may make the grants office look successful, the program will ultimately fall short of success since the programs secured through such a grants effort will not match institutional needs and will not receive support from faculty and staff. The entire grants operation will ultimately suffer as it becomes viewed as a self-serving thing apart from the rest of the college.

James F. Gollattscheck is President and Gary D. Hollingsworth is Director of Resource Development at Valencia Community College.

We recommend the "rifle" approach—carefully evaluating every grant possibility and going after those that allow the college to do those things it wishes to do and which are consistent with its mission, goals, and objectives. This approach will guarantee that those programs funded by grants will receive the backing of the institution and will improve the image of the grants office as a resource for the college. Since the college president provides the necessary linkage between an institution's needs and the capability of a grants office to meet those needs, he is the only one who can encourage that office to provide solutions to the many problems facing an institution of higher education.

The president's grasp of the grants office's activities is crucial. His relationship to and perception of the role of the grants office is vital to the office's success, especially when the efforts are coupled with a shared commitment to the institutional mission. Although a competent grants staff understands and supports generally-recognized institutional objectives, it is important that the staff have a clear knowledge of the college's mission and the role of grants in achieving that mission. The president can reinforce and redefine the direction of the college and, therefore, that of the grants office. The goals and priorities of the institution should be more apparent to the president than to any other person; his understanding should be clearly reflected in all development efforts.

The Successful Grant Solicitation Program

Before we examine the role of the president in assisting the grants effort, it is important that we analyze the elements that contribute to a successful grant solicitation program. The successes and failures of various institutions in securing funds from federal agencies suggests that there are certain elements characteristic of a successful grants effort. Dr. John Young, Director of Grants and Projects at Santa Fe Community College, Gainesville, recently completed a study of the variables involved in Florida community colleges with regard to federal funding.[1] In his study Dr. Young describes the factors most likely to affect the outcome of federal awards:

> Essential to the success of a [grants] program is the administrative decision that resource development activities will be a positive asset and a direction that the college should pursue . . . Imperative is the affirmative decision that the federal relations effort will be given top priority by the chief executive officer . . . and promotion [by the chief executive officer] with the professional faculty and staff.

Young identified "the support of the chief executive officer as being the single most important variable" to the success of the grants office. He further states:

> The closer the chief executive officer and the federal relations/resource development officer are in their perceptions and understanding of the variables associated with securing federal funds, the higher is the funding or the more effective is the federal relations/resource development effort; the greater the differences the less effective.

Young's study shows that not only is the positive attitude of the chief executive crucial but that his continued involvement in the grants process is responsible, in the final analysis, for generating and sustaining a successful grants program.

It appears, then, that colleges receiving the greatest amount of grant funds are those which realize that the president is the single most important component of the grants process. His impact upon the process and its successful result is achieved only when his involvement is an integral and ongoing part of the grants effort.

Young's observations of highly-funded institutions further reveal that:

- the high-funded institutions invest more dollars in supporting the federal relations/resource development function than do low-funded institutions
- personnel of the high-funded institutions are more sophisticated through travel, exposure, access to information, and agency contact than are personnel of the low-funded institutions
- high-funded institutions have full-time resource development officers with adequate support staff, while other institutions have individuals assigned part-time responsibilities for federal relations/resource development activities
- travel budgets and agency contacts are related to total dollars received; the more contacts and work-related travel, the greater the total dollars received
- high-funded institutions maintain a higher and more consistent level of funding than do low-funded institutions
- institutions committed to adequate staffing, maintaining the greatest access to information and agency contacts, having flexible budgets for development activities receive more dollars from federal sources.

Commitment of the President

As we discussed previously, the success of a college's grants efforts is commensurate with the commitment of the president. This commitment is expressed in many ways. For instance, the president can, by budget decisions, ensure that the grants office has access to the most current information through subscription to appropriate resource documents and grants newsletters. Also, it is important that direct lines of communication exist between the grants office and the president's office to ensure that pertinent information which has been given to the president be redirected. The commitment of the president is further expressed by his recognition of the necessity to produce the highest quality grant proposals. In order to produce well-written, well-prepared grant proposals it is essential to have a dedicated professional staff as well as adequate typing, graphic, and printing support. A budget which will cover necessary expenses of this type is vital.

Travel Allowances

It is our belief that another area of primary concern should be the provision of a sufficient travel allowance for the grants office. Again, a return to Young's study reveals that personnel of high-funded institutions are more effective because of their access to information from grantor agency personnel which results from their ability to travel to make appropriate contacts. Since guidelines for some programs change frequently, as do program priorities, travel to grant information sessions is also important. The information obtained as a result of travel minimizes the chance of misinterpretation of guidelines, a problem that affects even experienced grants writers.

Only through the president's efforts and the evidence of his commitment can the college's governing body be shown the necessity of the grants effort. This realization on the part of the governing board is important because their attitudes and actions greatly affect the attitude of the institution towards the solicitation of external funds. This positive attitude can be maintained by keeping the institution's governing body informed about the status of grants submitted, the progress of ongoing grants projects, and national opinion concerning grants activity. Since the governing board is so important to the ongoing development of the institution, their understanding of the grants process will assist the college by illustrating how well the institution's needs are being identified and met through the grants effort.

Faculty and Staff Involvement in Grantsgetting

Strong presidential support and involvement can help faculty and staff realize the need for grant funds and see the benefits to them individually and to the institution. Then assistance in the grants process can be maximized when the president undertakes a program of education, promotion, and cultivation of faculty and staff. When the staff and faculty work together with the president and the grants office staff to identify needs, set priorities, and collect data, appropriate grant alternatives can be developed. When the chief executive takes the time and effort to explain to faculty and staff institutional priorities, the importance of scrutinizing agency guidelines, and the necessity of matching the intended program's purposes with those of the funding source, the quality of faculty and staff proposals and program ideas will be greatly improved. Through their participation in the grants process, faculty and staff better appreciate the role of the grants office. As monies provided by grants are channeled to relevant areas, the faculty and staff will recognize that institutional needs are real and that they can be identified and addressed by a common commitment.

Another means of presidential involvement is building an incentive system to encourage faculty and staff participation in the grants process. In some institutions, the president recommends and supports supplementary financial compensation for grants development by providing a salary increase to the person named to direct a grant, or by providing release time not only while administering a funded project but also while preparing the grant application. The president can also reinforce the grants efforts by making faculty participation in the grants process part of a merit review system, or by including grant activity as a factor in determining academic rank. Recognition, both in the college and in the local and state communities, should also be given a faculty or staff member who receives a grant.

Selection of Funding Agencies

Appropriate cultivation of the grants process begins with an active search for agencies whose funding goals match institutional needs. Some pertinent information regarding both federal and foundation programs that are handled by professional and special interest groups is not readily available. Consequently, it is often found that only through the involvement of the chief executive, by means of informal contacts with agency personnel, is information concerning certain grant possibilities available.

Letters of Support

The president is often the most appropriate person at the institution to solicit certain letters of support which can greatly strengthen a proposal. Locally, or at the state or national level, his/her recognition by and prior contact with public officials, community leaders, or agency personnel can open doors and open them quickly. An increasing number of federal programs offers little time between the notice of the availability of program funds and the deadline for application completion. It is important, therefore, not only for the chief executive to have access to contacts, but to have immediate access as well.

The president, through his personal contacts with agency personnel, communicates two very important things. First, he shows that he is interested in and appreciates the program in question and, second and most important, that the program has his recognition and support and therefore possesses a greater probability for success.

Record of Success

Of utmost importance in any institution's ability to obtain grants is its record of success in carrying out previously funded projects. Only the president can guarantee institutional commitment to the successful completion of a project for which funds are being solicited. His involvement in the very beginning stages of deciding whether or not to apply for the grant, his knowledge of and assistance in the development of the proposal, and, most of all, his establishing institutional priorities in carrying out the college's obligation incurred by applying for and receiving the grant are imperative if the college is going to successfully meet the requirements of the proposal. Every funding agency is interested in giving its grants to institutions where the probability of successful completion is high. An institution develops its "track record" of success only through the successful completion of projects. There can be no substitute for the backing of the chief executive officer of the institution guaranteeing that those portions of the institution involved in the project will be mobilized and that institutional resources will be committed to the project. The president should be aware that every successfully completed project supported by a grant is an asset in seeking further grants. Every project not completed, or completed with only partial success, is a liability in the attaining of future grants. He should, therefore, weigh very carefully his own commitment and his institution's capability of successfully meeting all of the obligations and objectives incurred as a grant recipient.

Conclusion

The grants-oriented president is an individual who is actively involved in the entire grants effort rather than an administrator who is merely aware of the effort and gives it passive support. For maximum success the chief executive must foster the development of a grants effort by aggressive activity. Total involvement is essential. It is the president and the president alone who can cultivate the maximum development potential of the grants office and of his or her institution.

FOOTNOTE:

[1] John E. Young, *A Study to Determine Variables Associated With Success of Selected Florida Public Two-Year Community Junior Colleges in Obtaining Categorical Aid Funds from the Federal Government.* University of Florida, Gainesville, FL; June, 1977; Unpublished Dissertation.